Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreview125londuoft

96

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JANUARY, 1867. . . . . APRIL, 1867.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CXXV.

34134
20/6/94

LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER, LONDON.
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1867.

7

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1867.

No. CCLV.

ART. I.—1. *Parliamentary Blue Books relating to Bhootan.* 1865 *and* 1866.

2. *Selections from the Records of the Bombay Government, No. XXIV. New Series.* Bombay: Printed for Government at the Bombay Education Society's Press. 1856.

3. *Diary of a Journey across Arabia in the Year* 1819. By Capt. G. FORSTER SADLIER, of Her Majesty's 47th Regt. Compiled from the Records of the Bombay Government. Bombay: Printed at the Education Society's Press, Byculla. 1866.

4. *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society. Volume the Thirty-fifth. Article XV., A Visit to the Wahabee Capital, Central Arabia.* By Lieutenant-Colonel LEWIS PELLY, Her Majesty's Political Resident, Persian Gulf. London: 1865.

5. *Reports on the Political Condition of the Province of Toorkistan, and the Financial Resources of Tashkend, from the Governor-General of Orenburg to the Russian Minister of Finance, published in the 'Invalide Russe' of the 20th November* 1865.

THE Government of India is divided into five great departments—Foreign, Home, Military, Finance, and Public Works. Every order issued from any of these departments runs in the name of 'The Governor-General in Council.' And in the earlier days of the Anglo-Indian empire, when all cases used indifferently to be submitted for the collective consideration of the Governor-General and each member of his Council, this formula was a correct description of the mode in which the machinery of government actually worked. But as time

advanced, bringing with it additions of territory, improved administration, and better means of communication, it became impossible for so cumbrous an organisation to bear the strain of the enormously increased correspondence. At length Lord Canning remodelled the Council into the semblance of a Cabinet, with himself as president, and each member of the Government now holds a separate portfolio, and despatches the ordinary business connected with it upon his own responsibility, only reserving matters of exceptional importance for the opinion of a colleague or the decision of the assembled Council. The particular branch of administration which Lord Canning, Lord Elgin, and the present Governor-General have all successively reserved for their own special charge, is the Foreign Office of India.

The Indian Foreign Office is entrusted with the duty of directing our diplomatic relations—firstly, with all neighbouring foreign Powers beyond the limits of Hindostan; and, secondly, with all the dependent princes and chiefs of India. These two functions are obviously of supreme importance, for on these more than on any other departments of the State the maintenance of peace and the general policy of the empire depend. They are, however, necessarily secret in their operation, and they usually become known to the public by their results. Indeed, it may be affirmed that a large portion of the important diplomatic transactions in which the Governor-General of India is engaged never attract the notice of Parliament or of the British public. On some of these questions we are about to lay before our readers complete information. We shall not at present enter upon the controverted subject of the relations of the Supreme Government of India with the princes and chiefs who have retained some show of independence in that country, except to remark that Sir John Lawrence is a firm adherent of the non-intervention policy of the present day. But our object is to carry the reader beyond the frontiers of India to those less known regions in which we have to encounter the independent and barbaric races of the Asiatic continent.

Of course, in dealing with independent principalities and powers beyond the bounds of India, the Governor-General must act in concert with the English Cabinet whenever he is dealing with a European State or with any oriental nation, such as Persia and China, at whose Court there is a diplomatic representative of her Majesty. But, even subject to this limitation, the Indian Foreign Office yet remains the focus of politics for half Asia—the storehouse of the romance of all the

East. Murmurs of Dutch aggression in far Sumatra, and whispers of piratical prahus lurking amid the unexplored isles of the Malayan Archipelago; rumours of French enterprise in the feverish rice-swamps of Cochin-China, and quaint glimpses of Burmese life at the Court of the golden-footed monarch of Mandalay,—such are the varied contents of a mail-packet from the southern seas. Out of the west come tidings of pilgrim-caravans at Mecca, of pearl-fishers in the Persian Gulf, or of burning slave ships on the coast of equatorial Africa; the outrages of the Christian emperor in Abyssinia are not omitted, nor those of the Wahabee fanatic at Riad overlooked. North-eastward, down the Himalayan passes of Bhootan and Nepal, the life that slowly stirs among the lamas and monasteries of Thibet sends now and then a faint pulsation into Bengal; and lately the valley of Cashmere afforded a passage to envoys from the uncouth khans of Chinese Tartary. Finally, in the furthest north, beyond Affghanistan and the deserts of the wandering Turkomans, looms the giant form of steadily-advancing Russia. In fact, it would be hardly an exaggeration if the English viceroy's political range of vision were to be described in the sonorous syllables of Milton:—

> 'His eye might there command, wherever stood
> City of old or modern fame, the seat
> Of mightiest empire, from the destined wall
> Of Cambalu, seat of Cathaian Can,
> And Samarcand by Oxus, Temir's throne,
> To Paquin of Sinæan kings; and thence
> To Agar and Lahor of Great Mogul,
> Down to the golden Chersonese; or where
> The Persian in Ecbatan sat, or since
> In Hispahan; or where the Russian Ksar
> In Mosco; or the Sultan in Bizance,
> Turchestan-born; nor could his eye not ken
> The empire of Negus to his utmost port,
> Ercoco, and the less maritime kings,
> Mombaza and Quiloa and Melind.'

Descending, however, to the prose of current events, we find that the questions of external policy which at present chiefly command attention from the Government of India lie in the direction of Arabia and Central Asia. These, therefore, must be the main subject of our inquiry. But before we proceed to discuss our relations with either Mr. Palgrave's interesting friends, the Wahabees, or the picturesque ruffians in Affghanistan, there is another matter which, though of less importance, deserves a cursory notice, if only that the erroneous accounts of it which have reached England may not pass

altogether unchallenged. We allude to the recent war with Bhootan.

The facts are very simple. In December 1863, just a month before the accession of Sir John Lawrence to viceregal power, it was found necessary to send an envoy into Bhootan to demand reparation for a long series of injuries inflicted on our frontier villages. The mission failed; the envoy was subjected to gross insult, and compelled to sign a treaty re-adjusting the whole boundary between British India and Bhootan, and making other preposterous concessions to the Bhootan Government. This crowning outrage was more than could be endured. Sir John Lawrence instantly repudiated the document extorted from his envoy, and took measures for chastising the offenders. Of the tract of territory lying at the southern foot of the Bhootan hills, and known generally as the Dooars, the eastern portion, or the Assam Dooars, had hitherto been a kind of debateable land—that is, the British Government occupied the ground, but annually allowed 10,000 rupees, or one-third of the revenue, to the Deb and Dhurm rajahs as their share. Sir John Lawrence now announced to the Bhootan Government that this payment, as also the rent of another patch of land held by us in farm from Bhootan, had ceased for ever. Further, he demanded the restoration of all British subjects who, within the last five years, had been kidnapped by the Bhooteas; and he threatened that, unless the demand were fully complied with by the 1st of September, it would be enforced at the point of the sword. The Bhootan Government allowed the interval of grace to pass by without taking advantage of it. Accordingly, Sir John Lawrence, who had already extinguished all Bhootea rights in the seven Assam Dooars, now issued a proclamation, dated the 12th November 1864, by which the Western or Bengal Dooars, eleven in number, were likewise definitively incorporated into the Queen's Indian dominions, and the British frontier was advanced even beyond the plains, so as to include certain hill forts, and give us the command of the passes through which the Bhooteas had been wont to descend in their predatory incursions. The proclamation was, in fact, a declaration of war. But the Governor-General still looked to peace—the final aim of every war. A well-equipped force had by this time been assembled on the frontier, but it was not allowed to move until the terms upon which Bhootan might again be received into amity had been carefully settled and fully notified to all concerned. Within six weeks of the column being set in motion, every position in Bhootan which our programme had marked

for occupation was in our keeping. The Bhooteas made little resistance, and it was thought they had abandoned the contest. Suddenly, in January 1865, they debouched in force along almost our whole line. At Dewangiri the surprise was complete: an unreasonable panic arose among the garrison, and the post was disgracefully abandoned with the loss of two mountain train guns. But this disaster of a subordinate officer —the only one that occurred throughout the entire campaign— was soon retrieved in gallant style by General Tombs; and after the reoccupation of Dewangiri in April, not a Bhootea appeared in arms against us. Upon the cessation of hostilities, the Bhootea authorities gave frequent indications of a desire for peace. Their overtures were invariably met by a reference to the terms—still open to them—which had been offered in the previous November, and by an assurance that unless those terms were accepted before the opening of the cold season, they would see an advance of British troops upon their capital, Poonakha. Convinced at last, by the preparations made by Sir John Lawrence and Sir William Mansfield, that we were in earnest in what we said, they signified their willingness to treat. Their overtures were favourably received. The surrender of the treaty which had been extorted from our envoy, and a humble letter of apology for the insults to which he had been subjected, formed the commencement of the negotiations. Afterwards, on the 11th of November 1865, a treaty of peace was concluded upon the identical basis which the Government of India had from the outset held in view. The Bhootan Government formally ceded to us all the eighteen Dooars and the rest of the territory taken from them, and agreed to liberate all our kidnapped subjects; in return for these concessions the British Government undertook to pay the Deb and Dhurm rajahs annually, subject to the condition of their continued good behaviour, an allowance beginning at 25,000 rupees, and rising gradually to a maximum of twice that amount. Also, by a separate agreement simultaneously executed, the Bhootan Government engaged to procure restitution to us, by the 10th of January, of the two guns lost at Dewangiri. These guns had fallen into the possession of a powerful Bhootea noble known as the Tongso Penlo. He refused to give them up, in the hope that, by playing upon the desire of the British Government to recover trophies of war, and upon the desire of his own Government for peace, he might get himself constituted the channel through which the British allowance to Bhootan should be paid. The Deb and Dhurm rajahs sincerely endeavoured to fulfil their engagement, but the coercion of their

refractory vassal was beyond their ability. The task, therefore, was undertaken by a British force. Our troops started on the 3rd of February, but they had not made many marches towards Tongso when the Penlo, as had been anticipated, gave up the game, and submissively sent the guns into our camp.

So ended the Bhootan war. Its conclusion was greeted with a chorus of disapprobation from the Indian press. The honour of England, it was said, had been betrayed by a pusillanimous Government. We ought to have marched into the heart of Bhootan, humbled the rajahs in their capital, and exacted a condign retribution. Instead of doing so we had slunk back to the plains foiled in purpose, and content to purchase a dishonourable immunity from future aggressions at the cost of paying black mail to a crew of barbarous caterans. Divested of all rhetoric, the accusation seems to be that the conditions of the treaty were improperly lenient to Bhootan. It has been above explained that these conditions were the same as had been offered to the Bhooteas before hostilities commenced. Sir John Lawrence, therefore, cannot be charged with having lost heart in the struggle. The utmost that can be said is, either that in the original selection of a punishment for the Bhooteas their offences were too lightly judged, or that, as the fray proceeded, it became due to the honour of the arms tarnished at Dewangiri to wreak an increased vengeance on the foe. Neither of these suppositions will stand the test of cool inquiry. With regard to the first, it is certain that, short of the absorption of their whole country, the annexation of the Dooars was as severe a penalty as could have been inflicted on the Bhooteas. Their State had hitherto been mainly supported from this fertile tract, Bhootan Proper being a very poor country. In truth, the principal reason for allowing them to retain a beneficial interest in the Dooars was that, unless some such substitute for their usual means of maintenance were granted, they would be driven from sheer want to the very habits of depredation which the war was undertaken to suppress. But though originating in a sentiment of humanity, the measure was also recommended to the Government by considerations of policy. It was obviously desirable to secure some guarantee for the future good conduct of the Bhooteas, and the power of diminishing or altogether withholding an allowance which was essential almost to their bare existence, offered just the hold upon them that was wanted. Accordingly it was specially provided by the 5th Article of the treaty that the British Government should be at liberty,

at any time when the conduct of the Bhooteas might give cause for dissatisfaction, to suspend payment of the allowance either in whole or in part.

In reply to the second charge—namely, that the disgrace incurred at Dewangiri demanded to be wiped out in further slaughter—we prefer quoting the words of Sir William Mansfield:—

'Was it to be supposed that a people which, however barbarous and untaught, at least possessed the attribute of animal courage, would submit to the loss of a slip of territory which, in their eyes, was probably as valuable as the territory that remained to them—I say, was it to be supposed that a people in such circumstances would not stand up and fight for their own property? Surely nothing else could be expected, and the Bhooteas are hardly to be blamed on that account. Yet that was the head and front of their offending, which raised such a cry for more punishment. They stood up and fought; and I can only say that they are, in my opinion, to be respected for so doing. People clamoured for more punishment—for what? Because the Bhooteas came and reoccupied a few posts. What really took place? The first duty I had to perform on assuming my command was to receive the reports of the heavy blows delivered by Generals Tytler and Tombs at Bala and Dewangiri. I am justified in attributing that character to them, because, when the small number of the Bhootan population is considered, the actions they fought, with respect to the losses they incurred, must have assumed in their eyes such proportions as in great European contests would be attributed to pitched battles. This is undoubtedly true, notwithstanding that to us such actions appear as insignificant skirmishes. I say it with confidence. The numbers of Bhooteas reported to have been killed in General Tombs' affair having been reported to be 200, I ask with confidence if this was not a terrible retribution, with regard to the numbers of the Bhootan population, for the check sustained by our arms at Dewangiri? I am happy to say that such was the opinion of your Excellency's Government. If we had further pressed this miserable people, for the purpose of inflicting a still greater summary punishment, we should have laid ourselves open throughout the civilised world, both in India and in Europe, and even with those who had been most impatient at our assumed inaction, to a charge of inhuman oppression, and, I think I may say, cruelty. I am happy to think that this Government has escaped such a stigma.'

But enough of Bhootan. We must hasten to scenes of more immediate interest in Western Asia. On the moot question whether Mr. Palgrave's book added anything to the stock of information already available to the general public regarding the past history of the Wahabee power in Arabia, we have no desire again to enter. Our sympathies are certainly on the side of the author, whose amusing narrative

recently drew our attention to the subject. But there can be no doubt that the contemporaneous chronicles of the Indian Foreign Office, of the local Government at Bombay, and of the Residency at Bushire, do contain materials of a more detailed and trustworthy character than any it was in Mr. Palgrave's power to consult. During the last fifty years the Anglo-Indian agent in the Persian Gulf has been in frequent contact with the Wahabees of Nejed—for the Indian Government has good reason to watch with peculiar interest the proceedings of that sect. The fact is, that the same tenets which reign at Riad in an independent monarchy are scattered through the length and breadth of India in the far more dangerous form of secret confraternities, inspired with the most bigoted detestation of the infidel Feringhee. The Umbeyla campaign of 1863 affords an illustration in point. On that occasion it cost the army 847 men killed and wounded to subdue a small band of marauding fanatics on our far north-west frontier; and it has since been conclusively established that the head-centres of the band were the Wahabee priests of Patna—men of irreproachable respectability, who had been accounted, up to the moment of their detection, among the most inoffensive citizens that the unwarlike neighbourhood of Calcutta could produce.

Presuming that Mr. Palgrave's work and our former criticism of it have rendered our readers sufficiently familiar with the story of the Arabian Wahabees in its general outline, it may now be worth while to notice briefly the salient points in the past relations of British India with the Nejedee dynasty. Three different sets of circumstances have from time to time brought the two powers into contact — first, the audacious piracies carried on in the Persian Gulf, under the protection and encouragement of the Wahabees, by several maritime Arab tribes, especially the Joasmees; next, our interest in the two great invasions of Nejed by the Egyptians; and in the last place, our obligation to extend moral support to the kingdom of Oman and the chiefship of Bahrein against the encroachments incessantly directed against both of them from Dereyeeyah and Riad. Throughout all these complications the distinctive principle of our policy has been a desire to have as little to do with the Wahabees as possible, consistently with the necessity for maintaining the maritime peace of the Persian Gulf; and, above all, to avoid a downright collision with them. Thus, when a naval expedition was despatched against the Joasmee pirates in 1809, the full effect of the blow was certainly marred by the forbearance which the officer in command was ordered

to show towards the Wahabees. Again, when the Imam of Muscat, or, as he is more properly called, the Sultan of Oman, shortly afterwards entreated our assistance against the Wahabees, he was told that the British Government had no particular interest in the quarrel, and that he had better make what terms he could with his adversaries. Next came the first Egyptian invasion of Nejed—a cause of great relief to the Sultan. It was now the turn of the Wahabee Ameer to raise signals of distress. He sent an envoy to the British Residency at Bushire, proposing to enter into a treaty of amity and free trade with us. But his suit was as unsuccessful as that of the Sultan had previously been; we politely declined giving him any countenance. When the news reached India, in 1818, that Ibrahim Pasha had captured and destroyed Dereyeeyah, and was meditating an advance to the shores of the Persian Gulf, the Marquis of Hastings conceived the design of allying the English arms by land and sea with the Egyptian conqueror, and so making a clean sweep of all the littoral nests of piracy, whether Joasmee or Wahabee. Captain Sadlier, of Her Majesty's 47th Regiment, was the officer selected to conduct the necessary negotiations with Ibrahim Pasha. In quest of the Pasha, whose camp was at Medina, and afterwards in his company, Captain Sadlier, as is well known, traversed the breadth of the Arabian peninsula—from Kateef, on the Persian Gulf, to Yambo, on the Red Sea. Politically, however, the enterprise was a failure. Ibrahim Pasha, so far from desiring to push his conquests further east, was content to rest on his laurels, and had, in fact, begun his march homewards before Captain Sadlier arrived. He sailed from Jeddo for Suez at the same time that Captain Sadlier, *re infectâ*, took his departure for Bombay. The year 1834 brought a renewal of the question* whether our treaty engagements with the Sultan of Oman did not demand the interposition of British force to save him from the Wahabees. Lord William Bentinck repudiated any such liability. He even went so far as to contemplate, unmoved, the contingency of the Wahabees seizing the port of Muscat and making it a base for the renewal of piracy in the Gulf: 'It would be much easier,' he said, 'and cheaper 'to chastise them then, than to take up the matter as it stood, 'and constitute ourselves the guardians of the Sultan's posses-'sions against all comers.'

* By Article II. of the Treaty of 1798, the friends and enemies of either Government are to be the friends of the other. But in practice this provision has always been a dead letter for both parties.

Once more, the aid which the Sultan could not obtain from England, came to him indirectly through an Egyptian diversion. Khoorshed Pasha in 1836 advanced with a large force from Medina, and in two years made himself master of all Nejed, Hasa, and Kateef. But this time India had no welcome for the Egyptian commander. The policy of the Indian Government was no longer coloured by exclusively oriental considerations, but had to take its tone from Lord Palmerston, who at this juncture was carrying through, in conjunction with the Northern Powers, his determination to reduce Mahomed Ali, the too powerful Pasha of Egypt, to subordination as a vassal of the Porte. That ebullition of hostility to Egypt and to France produced a singular indirect result on the politics of Arabia. Instead of viewing the downfall of Wahabee fanaticism, and the rise of semi-civilised Egypt in its stead, with complacency, the Indian Government omitted no effort of diplomacy to counteract Khoorshed Pasha's progress. Strong remonstrances were addressed to Mahomed Ali by the English Consul-General at Cairo. The result was, that in May 1840 the Egyptians yielded to our pressure and evacuated Arabia. Within three years after their departure the Wahabees were once more an organised power under their rightful Ameer, Feysul.

One of Feysul's first acts was to address a communication to the Resident at Bushire, begging for the friendship of the British Government. His advances met with a civil reply ; but it was at the same time significantly remarked that our presence in his vicinity had no other object than the preservation of peace on the waters of the Persian Gulf. Almost simultaneously with the exchange of these barren courtesies, the preponderating influence which Feysul had acquired at Bahrein and elsewhere on the coast began to inspire the Bombay Government with uneasiness. But Lord Ellenborough, to whom the question was referred, declined to interfere, and in 1844 his successor, Lord Hardinge, took the same view. The latter, however, consented, the following year, to a naval demonstration off the Batinah coast on behalf of the Sultan of Oman, whose territories had been invaded by the Wahabees in considerable numbers. Not a shot was fired from the British ships, but their presence enabled the Sultan to purchase peace from Feysul at the cost of an annual tribute.

Similar demonstrations were made for the protection, in 1851, of Bahrein, and, in 1853, of Oman for the second time. The invasion, checked in the latter instance, was of a very serious character. It was led by Feysul's son, Abdallah, who did not retire until he had extorted from the Sultan a large sum of

ready money, and an agreement to pay double the former tribute. In 1859 it required the presence of the whole English squadron before Kateef to induce Feysul's deputy at that place to abandon his designs on Bahrein and sue for pardon; but on this, as on previous occasions, a threatening attitude proved sufficient for our purpose. Once only—in 1861—did the British Government commit itself to actual hostilities with the Wahabees, and even then it was rather the semblance than the reality of war that we displayed. Feysul, influenced probably by sentiments of Arab hospitality, had refused to comply with our demand that he should expel from his fort at Daman a political refugee, whose intrigues for sixteen years had kept Bahrein and all its neighbourhood in a ferment. The Resident, therefore, proceeded to obtain satisfaction by force. An hour's distant firing from a steamer, to which the twin forts of Daman and Kateef made no response, and which terminated without a man being touched on either side, gave the Wahabee Governor a decent excuse for expelling the obnoxious chief; and there the dispute ended. This incident gave rise to a remarkable proceeding on the part of the Turkish Governor-General of Bagdad. That functionary entered a formal protest against the Resident's conduct, on the ground that Feysul was only the Porte's vicegerent in Nejed, and that the fort of Daman was an integral part of the Turkish empire. The protest was disallowed by the English consul-general at Bagdad; for, although it is not improbable that since the second Egyptian invasion the Wahabee Ameer has remained tributary to the Turkish authorities at Mecca—the tribute being regarded as an offering to the head of his religion—there is no controverting the fact that the practical authority of the Porte in Nejed is *nil.* The incident, however, is deserving of remark, because the Wahabees, when it suits their purpose, are rather given to making parade of their nominal dependence on Constantinople.

We now proceed to narrate transactions of a more recent date, to which the foregoing occurrences formed a necessary introduction. In the interior of Oman, about 100 miles west of Muscat, there is a fort and district called Rostak, the charge of which, two years ago, was held by Syud Ges, a kinsman of the Sultan. Syud Ges becoming restive, the Sultan marched out of Muscat to coerce him. Opposition was offered, and while the Sultan was still besieging the fort, Toorkee bin Ahmed Sudeyree, the commandant of the Wahabee stronghold at Bereymah, came up in force, and insisted on the contending parties accepting his mediation. The Sultan was consequently obliged to abandon the siege, and return humiliated

to Muscat. No sooner had the troops of Oman disappeared than the Wahabee seized the fort he professedly had come to rescue, ravaged the surrounding territory, killed some of the inhabitants, and extorted from the rest a large pecuniary ransom. Intelligence of this outrage reached Bushire in December 1864. The Residency was at that time, and is still, held by Colonel Lewis Pelly, an officer who, during his previous employment in Scinde, had acquired the entire confidence of the Governor of Bombay, and also was not unknown to the Anglo-Indian public—for the two dissimilar reasons, that in 1858 he wrote a foolish book, and in 1860 had the enterprise to travel from Teheran through Herat, Candahar, and Beloochistan, to the British frontier in Scinde. Colonel Pelly now, on his own responsibility, determined to visit the Wahabee Ameer at Riad. He started from the port of Koweit on the 18th of February 1865, accompanied by a naval officer, Lieutenant Dawes, and the Residency surgeon, Dr. Colvill. Feysul received the party civilly, and during their short stay at Riad, Lieutenant Dawes succeeded in ascertaining the latitude and longitude of the city, and Dr. Colvill, we believe, procured some interesting geological and botanical specimens. But otherwise the expedition was without any result. Returning from the interior, Colonel Pelly emerged* on the 18th March near Bahrein, and from thence embarked for Bushire, where he arrived before the end of March. Very soon afterwards he came to England on leave for six months. During his absence fresh indignities befell the Sultan of Oman. First of all, a delegate from Feysul arrived at Muscat, demanding four times the amount of the usual tribute. Then Abdool Azeez, a brother of the Sudeyree, who in the preceding year had harried Rostak, made his appearance as a Wahabee agent among the Beni

* The security with which Colonel Pelly visited Riad has at times been quoted in disparagement of Mr. Palgrave's adventures. Some critics have even gone so far as to imply that there was no necessity for Mr. Palgrave to have stooped to the immorality of disguise. These people forget that Colonel Pelly travelled with all the prestige attaching to the well-known office of Resident at Bushire, and that it is not given to everyone to enjoy so redoubtable an advantage. Besides, even if, for argument's sake, it be conceded that Mr. Palgrave, in a shooting coat, would for twelve months have been as safe as Colonel Pelly was for one month in a scarlet uniform, there needs very little experience of the East to know that no recognised European ever has a chance of obtaining such an admission to the inner life of the people as it was the principal object of Mr. Palgrave's wanderings to obtain.

Boo Ali and Jenubah tribes in the southern province of Jaalan, and, with the assistance of these disaffected Arabs, besieged and captured Soor, a port about 80 miles below Muscat, plundering the bazaar and shooting some of the inhabitants. Lastly, a threatening cloud of Wahabees gathered about Ras-ool Khyma in the Joasmee territory, north of Oman. In short, when Colonel Pelly returned to India towards the close of 1865, there was general disorder along the whole frontier, and the Sultan's prospects looked as gloomy as they had ever been during the Wahabee irruption of 1853.

Colonel Pelly arrived at Muscat on the 25th November, bringing with him apparently *carte blanche* from the Bombay Government to do whatever he might think best for the Sultan's protection. The first intelligence that reached him was that Feysul, the famous Wahabee Ameer, was undoubtedly dead, though Abdallah, who had succeeded to the throne, was doing his best to keep the event secret. The Government of Nejed was still carried on in Feysul's name, and Abdallah even shrank not from the irony of putting his father's seal to despatches which declared the writer to be, 'by the blessing of God, in 'good health.' Feysul's disappearance from the scene was unquestionably a great point in the Sultan's favour. Colonel Pelly urged the Sultan to take advantage of the confusion to which it had given rise among the enemy. Bereymah was the keystone of the Wahabee power for annoyance, and this place Colonel Pelly thought the Omanee troops might take by land, while by sea English co-operation might perhaps undertake the blockade of the Wahabee ports. The latter part of the scheme was not, however, easy of execution. Irrespective of the Resident's steam yacht, the 'Berenice,' there was only one English man-of-war in the Gulf—the 'Highflyer'—and Captain Pasley, who commanded the latter vessel, was under orders to return to Bombay as soon as possible. Under the pressure of this difficulty, Colonel Pelly conceived that he had no alternative but summary action, such as he had not at first contemplated. He addressed a communication to the Ameer of Nejed, demanding in peremptory terms a written apology for the late Wahabee outrages in Oman, and also payment of 27,700 dollars as compensation for the Hindoo-British subjects residing at Soor whose property had been plundered by Abdool Azeez. This ultimatum was delivered by Captain Pasley to the Shaikh of Kateef on the 12th of January for despatch to Riad, and seventeen days from that date were allowed for compliance with the terms. On the 30th the 'Highflyer' returned to Kateef for an answer. The Shaikh had no answer to give; and there-

upon, in accordance with instructions received beforehand from Colonel Pelly, Captain Pasley commenced hostilities against the place. The shallow waters of the bay refused admittance to his ship, and his heavy boats were unable to approach within 1,200 yards of the shore. The native agent, however, who, in Colonel Pelly's absence at Muscat, acted as political adviser to the expedition, assured Captain Pasley that the fort of Daman was defended by only twelve men; and, upon this representation, it was determined to take the crews of two light cutters to the assault. Even these boats grounded a long distance from the beach, so that Lieutenant Long and his thirty gallant followers had to wade through 300 yards of mud and sand before they found themselves in the presence of the enemy. They carried the lower story of the fort with a rush, but this success only showed them that to attempt anything more was hopeless. Gates and walls, manned by marksmen far more numerous than their own small party, still separated them from the principal towers. There was nothing to do but to retire to the boats. They did so in good order, but with a loss altogether of two seamen killed, and one officer and two seamen wounded. After this affair, the unfortunate issue of which must be ascribed to the deficiency of the local information at Captain Pasley's command, and to the culpable imprudence with which the enterprise was attempted, the 'Highflyer' returned to Muscat, and being there joined by the 'Berenice,' the two vessels proceeded southwards to Soor, the scene of the Jenubah insurrection. Arriving at Soor on the 11th of February, Colonel Pelly gave six hours' notice to all non-combatants to clear out of the forts and the neighbourhood of the shipping. The 'Highflyer,' then opened fire, and after a three hours' bombardment, reduced the forts to ruins. The next morning her boats went up the Soor creek, and destroyed or confiscated every vessel belonging to the Jenubahs. With this measure of chastisement, active operations terminated. The 'Highflyer' started for Bombay on the 13th, and Colonel Pelly the same day returned up the Gulf towards the telegraph station at Cape Mussendom.

That very day there was enacted at Sohar a tragedy, before which, to borrow an expression from Colonel Pelly, the horrors of Macbeth must pale. Sohar is on the Batinah coast, north of Muscat, and not far from the inland fortress of Bereymah. Mr. Palgrave's friends will remember it as the port of his departure on the unlucky coasting voyage in which he was wrecked. Hither had come Sultan Thoweynee, in order to organise a campaign against the Wahabees at Bereymah. On the fatal 13th of February he lay down in an upper chamber

to sleep—his 'custom always in the afternoon.' Stealing upon his secure hour, his son, Syud Salim, with a Wahabee attendant named Besharee, crept up the staircase, entered the chamber, and silently closed the door from the inside. Besharee drew a double-barrelled pistol from under his cloak. Salim signalled to him to fire. But Besharee handed the weapon to the prince, and drew his dagger, intimating by a noiseless gesture that if the pistol failed to do its work, he would 'mak' sikker' with cold steel. Salim then fired both barrels into his father's forehead, and all was over. Thoweynee had passed from sleep to death without a struggle. The murderers threw a sheet over the corpse, and hurried downstairs. Their first care was to seize Syud Toorkee, the late Sultan's brother, and throw him heavily ironed into a dungeon. It was then given out in the town that Thoweynee had died of fever. At nightfall the body was secretly buried under the floor of an inner room, and the parricide rode off with his accomplices to take possession of the kingly power at Muscat.

Vague rumours of what had happened at Sohar reached Colonel Pelly at Cape Mussendom on the 20th. He lost no time in coming to see for himself how matters stood at Muscat. Calling at Sohar on his way, he succeeded in effecting the release of Syud Toorkee. At Muscat, where he arrived on the 2nd March, he found everything in confusion. Syud Salim had thrown himself into the hands of the Wahabee faction, and was the mere creature of their behests. On the 6th, Colonel Pelly obtained intelligence that the Salim had a plot on foot for suddenly attacking the 'Berenice' that night, as she lay at anchor. Whatever may have been the amount of truth in this report, there is no doubt that the 'Berenice' had not the means of defending herself if attacked, and that all the Hindoos of Muscat were in utter panic. Colonel Pelly therefore acted as prudence dictated, and, after having taken on board all persons who had any claim to British protection, steamed quietly out of the harbour.

All these events—from the first appearance of the 'Highflyer' in the Gulf up to the 'Berenice's' retirement from Muscat—had followed one upon another in such quick succession, that there had been little time for the Bombay Government to refer for instructions to Calcutta. In judging, therefore, of Sir John Lawrence's foreign policy, it must be understood that he is not responsible for any of Colonel Pelly's proceedings. But we must be permitted to observe that the British agent at Bushire appears to have acted with small discretion; and it is painful to reflect how little control it is possible for the Govern-

ment of this country or of India to exercise over its officers in these remote regions, while perhaps irreparable mischief has been done. The very first opportunity that the Government of India obtained for interposing its authority arose out of the arrival at Bombay of envoys from Syud Salim. These envoys were the bearers of a letter, in which their master protested against the recent deportation of Hindoo merchants from Muscat in the 'Berenice,' and pointed to the perfect safety of all the property which had then been abandoned as a proof that he had been unjustifiably discredited by Colonel Pelly's apprehensions. Sir John Lawrence decided that this letter should be answered in terms of frigid civility. It was impossible to continue to Syud Salim the relations of personal friendship which our officers had cultivated with his father; but it was equally undesirable that the diplomatic relations of two States mutually necessary to each other should be suddenly and completely broken off for the crime of an individual. It was no part of the duty of the British Government to avenge the death of the late Sultan of Muscat, or to punish the guilt of his successor.

While this question was being discussed in India, affairs in the Gulf had righted themselves with singular rapidity. The inducements which usually led the British Government to assist, and the Wahabees to attack, Oman, had alike been much weakened by recent events. The new ruler had no title to our regard, while, on the other hand, he was the publicly declared ally of the Wahabee Governor at Bereymah. A further reason why the Wahabees should, for a time at any rate, show a peaceable bearing to their neighbours, was the fear lest our unsuccessful attack on Kateef might only be the prelude to more serious hostilities. The Ameer Abdallah regarded this contingency with alarm. He took early measures for averting the storm by the despatch of two emissaries from Riad—one to entreat the mediation of his suzerain at Constantinople, and the other to patch up a peace with the English representative at Bushire. The first messenger, though he carried with him two Nejedee horses as a present for the Sultan, advanced no further than Bagdad, being turned back by the Turkish Governor-General of that province. The second has recently been engaged in negotiations with Colonel Pelly, and the conciliatory spirit he displays gives reason to hope that the several causes of dissatisfaction which the British Government has against the Ameer of Nejed are in a fair way of adjustment. It only remains to be added that all is quiet again at Muscat, and that the traders who fled have now returned to their former avocations.

From the glittering waves of the Persian Gulf we must now take flight to the bare steppes and monstrous mountains of Central Asia. In that inhospitable region, the State which, from its geographical position, must always be viewed with the greatest interest by England is Affghanistan. This kingdom, during the last years of Dost Mahomed's reign, presented the appearance of as compact and independent a government as even the authors of the Affghan war could ever have hoped artificially to create on our north-west frontier. Dost Mahomed's last feat, performed when he must have been close on eighty years of age, was to wrest Herat from Persian influence. He died on the 9th June 1863, twelve days after he had taken the city by storm. From that moment the Nemesis of Mahomedan polygamy, in the usual form of children by different mothers scrambling for the inheritance, has laid its curse of anarchy and civil war heavily on Affghanistan.

The old Ameer left sixteen sons. Four of these were too young at the time of his death to have acquired any personal influence; but of the elder twelve, every single man aspired, if not to sole supremacy as his father's successor, at any rate to a separate principality independent of any brother's control. Those whose ambition aimed at the entire kingdom were five in number*—namely, Ufzul and Azim Khan, sons of one mother; and Shere Ali, Ameen Khan, and Shureef Khan, sons of another and more high-born lady.

Ufzul Khan, aged fifty-two, the eldest of Dost Mahomed's sons, bore the reputation of being also the bravest; his conquests in the north had added considerable territory to the Affghan dominions, and for some time past he had been governing with vigour and popularity the whole tract lying between the Hindoo Khoosh and the Oxus. (This province, known to the Affghans as Toorkistan, we shall prefer to speak of as Balkh, in consequence of the Russians having appropriated the former name for the districts of their southern frontier.) The head-quarters of Ufzul Khan's Government were fixed at Tukhtapool,

* The most prominent of the seven chiefs figuring as partisans rather than principals were Wullee Mahomed, Fyz Mahomed, and Uslum Khan. In this same class may be also ranked two grandsons of Dost Mahomed, Futteh Mahomed and Jellal-ood-deen Khan, sons of the famous Akbar Khan, who murdered Sir William Macnaghten. Futteh Mahomed had courage and ability, and Jellal-ood-deen Khan deserves notice because a recent journey through India to Mecca and Constantinople had inspired him with apparently a sincere regard for the English, such as no other Barukzye sirdar pretended to feel.

a city which has risen on the ruins of the ancient and more familiar Balkh, or Bactra. Perhaps it was this proximity to Bokhara that first suggested the matrimonial connexions subsisting between his son and daughter and a daughter and son of the King of Bokhara. Ufzul Khan was still at Tukhtapool when Herat fell and Dost Mahomed died.

Azim Khan is described by Dr. Bellew, who saw him in 1857, as a middle-aged man of very tall stature and herculean frame, with a dignified and commanding mien. Little, if at all, inferior to Ufzul Khan as a soldier, he was incomparably Ufzul Khan's superior in state-craft. Without any real love for the English, Azim Khan had yet established a strong claim upon our goodwill by the course he adopted in 1857, when the whole Affghan nation clamoured to be led down the passes that they might join the mutineer sepoys in a meritorious extermination of the infidel English. Dost Mahomed would perhaps have been unable to resist the popular cry but for Azim Khan's steadfast and openly declared advocacy of the English cause. The eastern districts of Khoorm and Khost, bordering upon the Indian frontier, were Azim Khan's charge, but he had left them to follow the Affghan army to Herat.

All the three princes forming the second group of competitors had likewise accompanied their father to Herat. The youngest of the trio, Shureef Khan, aged thirty, held the south-western districts of Furrah and Ghirishk. Not wanting in military courage, he probably shone best as a civil administrator. He had somehow accumulated more treasure than any of his brothers, but he marred this important advantage by a fickleness of spirit extraordinary even in an Affghan: unstable as water, he was the Reuben of these Beni-Israel, foredoomed not to excel.

Very different in character was Ameen Khan, Governor of Candahar, in the south—a bold impetuous man, who always took the shortest road to his object, and suffered no temptation or obstacle to baulk his purpose.

Shere Ali, forty years of age, was perhaps not equal to Ufzul Khan as a general, or to Azim Khan as a statesman, but he was, nevertheless, an adept in the arts both of peace and of war, as understood among his countrymen; and if it had not been that his many fine qualities were alloyed by an ungovernable temper, which at times entirely swamped his judgment, he might well have been recognised by others besides his father as the flower of the family. Shere Ali's political proclivities had hitherto been towards a Persian rather than an English alliance.

Shere Ali it was whom Dost Mahomed, some time before the expedition to Herat, had publicly selected as his successor, passing over the claims of both the elder princes, Ufzul Khan and Azim Khan. The selection, according to family custom, was authoritative. Shere Ali ever since had borne the designation of heir-apparent; and when Dost Mahomed died, none ventured to question his title to succeed. Even Azim Khan himself in that first hour of confusion was fain to join in the general homage due to Shere Ali as rightful Ameer of Affghanistan.

Signs of disaffection to the new ruler soon showed themselves. First Ameen Khan, then Shureef Khan, and lastly Azim Khan, abruptly quitted Herat, and retired to their respective fortresses in Candahar, Ghirishk, and Khoorm. The Ameer himself began his return march towards Cabul on the 5th of July, leaving his third son, Yakoob Khan, as Governor of Herat. He reached Ghuznee on the 24th of August, and halted there in order to ascertain what Azim Khan was about in the neighbouring district of Khoorm. His inquiries elicited very unsatisfactory intelligence. He therefore diverged eastward with his whole force into Khoorm, and compelled Azim Khan, who was hardly prepared for such prompt action, to tender a formal submission. The two brothers then embraced: Azim Khan swore fealty to the Ameer, and in return obtained a confirmation of all the dignities and emoluments he had enjoyed during the late reign. The Ameer, having thus scotched his snake, recommenced the march to Cabul, which city he finally reached on the 9th of September. Before the end of the year he had the satisfaction of receiving regular recognition from the British Government as successor to Dost Mahomed's vacant throne.

The winter passed away without any event of importance; even Barukzye restlessness is not proof against 'the 'mesmeriser snow.' But with the first genial breath of spring both Ufzul Khan and Azim Khan were up and doing. The former, notwithstanding that he had begun by sending in letters to Herat replete with protestations of the most devoted loyalty to Shere Ali, now scrupled not to proclaim himself throughout Balkh as Ameer of Affghanistan: indeed, his preparations for making good the claim by force of arms were already well advanced. The latter was busily organising an insurrection in Khoorm; but he hesitated to engage in any overt outbreak, being anxious that all the odium of the intended rupture might fall upon the Ameer. With this object he left his fort of Gurdez with a garrison so insufficient as to invite attack. The

bait took. One of the Ameer's officers indiscreetly pounced on the fort in his sovereign's name, and Azim Khan was at once provided with a pretext for rebellion. The Ameer met the double danger boldly. On the 20th of April 1864 he despatched the best soldier in his kingdom, Mahomed Rufeek, to crush Azim Khan in the south-east, while he himself marched northwards to meet Ufzul Khan's more formidable invasion. Fortune favoured his tactics. As soon as Mahomed Rufeek entered Khoorm, Azim Khan's venture utterly collapsed. Abandoned by his troops, Azim Khan on the 16th of May fled for refuge into British territory, and became a pensioner of Sir John Lawrence at Rawul Pindee.

In the meantime the armies of the Ameer from Cabul and of Ufzul Khan from Tukhtapool had come face to face in the mountain defiles of the Hindoo Khoosh near Bameean. On the 3rd of June an indecisive but hotly-contested action took place between the advance guards of either host, at a place called Bajgah. The Ameer's troops in this engagement were commanded by his eldest son, the heir-apparent, who displayed great gallantry, killing two of the enemy with his own hand. Two days afterwards the Ameer was reinforced by the arrival of Mahomed Rufeek with the troops which had been employed in suppressing Azim Khan's disturbances in Khoorm. Such a concentration of the Ameer's whole strength was more than Ufzul Khan was prepared to meet; he had calculated that Azim Khan would have found full employment for half the Cabul army On the other hand, family traditions, as well as the nearly equal strength of the opposing force, disposed the Ameer to avoid further bloodshed. With these sentiments prevailing in either camp, the natural result was peace. The Ameer and Ufzul Khan publicly embraced one another on the 29th of June; and the reconciliation which followed was, to all outward appearance, perfect. It was agreed that the two armies should proceed peaceably together into Balkh, and that, after having seen something of the province with his own eyes, the Ameer should then define Ufzul Khan's future position in the State. In pursuance of this arrangement, the brothers proceeded harmoniously to Tashkoorghan, a town about forty miles south-east of Tukhtapool. Here, on the 9th of August, Ufzul Khan's claims were settled to his satisfaction by nearly the whole of his former government being restored to him. For yet another fortnight all went merry as a marriage bell, and then came a sudden crash. The conduct at Tukhtapool of Ufzul Khan's son, Abdool Rehman, having given rise to some suspicion, the Ameer summoned the young chief to his

presence. Abdool Rehman, instead of obeying the summons, fled across the Oxus into Bokhara. Perhaps the Ameer wanted an excuse for long-meditated treachery; perhaps his ordinary principles of action were overwhelmed in a sudden tempest of anger; but whatever may have been the motive, he visited the sins of Abdool Rehman on his father, Ufzul Khan. In public durbar he called up one of his kinsmen, gave him a pair of leg-irons, and bade him seize and fetter Ufzul Khan. The Sirdar had the independence to remonstrate, and begged that, if the Ameer persisted in his determination, some one else might be found to do his bidding. Almost beside himself with passion, the Ameer turned to a more complaisant courtier, General Sheikh Meer, and insisted on being obeyed. The general took the irons and repaired with them to Ufzul Khan's quarters. Placing them respectfully before the old prince, he informed him of the Ameer's order. Ufzul Khan said, 'It is God's will;' and, spitting three times on his own beard, stretched out his legs, when the general affixed the irons and left him.

Intense excitement followed this *coup d'état.* The Affghan nobles had seen the Ameer only two days previously at the tomb of one of their holiest saints swear fidelity to Ufzul Khan solemnly on the Koran; and the fresh remembrance of that scene effectually destroyed their faith in the Ameer, and diverted all their sympathy to his wronged prisoner. Several of them hurried across the Oxus to join Abdool Rehman in Bokhara; others fled to Ameen Khan at Candahar; those that still stayed by the Ameer held aloof from personal contact with a temper which they had now greater cause than ever for mistrusting. As for the gallant army which, under Ufzul Khan, had so well held its own against the Ameer in the passes of the Hindoo Khoosh, it melted away like a snowdrift. Some small portion accepted a service of doubtful fidelity under the Ameer, and one body of 800 regular troops made good its retreat to Candahar; but the majority dispersed in plundering parties over the northern districts. From Tashkoorghan the Ameer proceeded to Tukhtapool. There the confiscation of Ufzul Khan's property, and the deportation of his zenana to Cabul, occupied some time. Early in October the Ameer appointed his nephew, Futteh Mahomed, Governor of Balkh, and turned his own steps southwards to the capital. He entered Cabul in triumphal procession on the 14th of November.

Meanwhile the fugitive Abdool Rehman had been received with open arms by his father-in-law, the King of Bokhara.

The tale of Ufzul Khan's wrongs, confirmed as it was by the production of the Koran bearing the seal of the perjured Ameer, moved general indignation. The King laid the case before his College of Divines, and when the learned men replied by pronouncing sentence of excommunication against the Ameer, he declared to the assembled Court his royal intention of espousing Abdool Rehman's quarrel at the head of an army of 10,000 men.

Nor was it from the north alone that danger threatened the Ameer. The signs of the times were equally menacing in the south. Ameen Khan for months had been exerting all his energies to put Candahar in a state of defence, and now, just as his plans for throwing down the gauntlet to the Ameer approached maturity, he obtained the important assistance of Shureef Khan's money bags. Shureef Khan and he, with their nephew, Jellal-ood-deen, as a subordinate member of the triumvirate, entered into a compact to stand by each other against the Ameer to the last extremity.

It must have been an anxious time, therefore, that winter of 1864–65, at Cabul, though the severity of the Affghan climate guaranteed the Ameer immunity from any immediate attack. Snow still lay deep over all the country, when the ball was opened in the Candahar direction by a forward movement on the part of Jellal-ood-deen to capture the important fortress of Khelat-i-Ghilzye, on the road towards Ghuznee and Cabul. The attempt was unsuccessful; Jellal-ood-deen, after a six weeks' sap, being obliged, on the 28th March 1865, to abandon the siege and fall back on Julduk, a place thirteen miles to the south. But as a signal for malcontents to bestir themselves, Jellal-ood-deen's efforts were by no means labour lost. Azim Khan, whose intriguing correspondence with the Candahar chiefs had been a source of incessant trouble to his hosts throughout the ten months of his sojourn in British territory, now recrossed the border; and betaking himself to his old haunts of Khoorm and Khost, raised a standard of revolt, to which numbers of the wild Wuzeeree tribe were very soon attracted. He had already received considerable aid in money from Ufzul Khan's wife, a princess of masculine courage and energy; and about this time she sent him 25,000 rupees, with a message that now or never was the time to show his manhood; if he had none to show, he had better spend the present remittance in buying a shroud, for he should get no more from her.

Still the Ameer rose to face his various foes undauntedly. Recurring to the plan of campaign which last year had served

his turn so well, he despatched Mahomed Rufeek against Azim Khan, with instructions to disperse the Khoorm insurgents as soon as possible, and then join the main army, which he intended himself to lead against Candahar.

Mahomed Rufeek, thus limited as to time, was unable to accomplish much in Khoorm. Azim Khan at his approach fled to the Wuzeeree Hills, and the Ameer's orders allowed no leisure for a pursuit. All that Mahomed Rufeek could do was to offer a large reward for the capture of the rebel prince, hastily pacify the disturbed tract, and then make the best of his way to the Ameer's camp.

He effected a junction with the Ameer at Mookhur, forty miles south of Ghuznee, on the 28th of May, and the united army reached Khelat-i-Ghilzye about the 3rd of June. By this time Jellal-ood-deen had been joined by the other confederate sirdars, Ameen Khan and Shureef Khan, and from Julduk the entire Candahar force had advanced to a position within two miles of Khelat-i-Ghilzye. A collision was therefore imminent, and the chances seemed not to be in favour of the Ameer; for, although the two belligerent parties were about equal in point of numbers (say 12,000 men with 20 guns on either side), the Candahar troops were better fed than those of Cabul, and their *morale* was unquestionably superior. The battle took place at Kujhbaz on the 6th of June One wing of the Ameer's army, under the command of his eldest son, attacked Ameen Khan's battalions, while Rufeek Khan led the other against Shureef Khan. After four hours' fighting the Candahar troops had gained ground considerably, and were pressing their advantage with vigour. At this moment the Ameer dashed up to his son's side and taunted him with incapacity for command. Stung by such a reproof, the gallant heir-apparent put himself at the head of his men and led a charge of desperate valour, which carried everything before it. In the *mêlée* the prince found himself face to face with Ameen Khan. A hand-to-hand combat ensued between the uncle and nephew, each giving and receiving some severe sword cuts. Suddenly Ameen Khan drew a pistol from his girdle and shot the heir-apparent through the head. Five Cabulees at once avenged their leader, and Ameen Khan fell, riddled with bullets, by the side of his brother's son. This was the turning-point of the battle. The Candahar army wavered, broke, and fled, and the day was gained for the Ameer. Eighteen guns and many prisoners (including Azim Khan's eldest son, Surwar Khan), fell into the Ameer's hands. But, in the words of his own despatch from the field of battle, grief for the loss of his

son 'clouded all the joy of victory.' For four days the Cabul troops remained inactive, allowing Shureef Khan and Jellal-ood-deen to take back their shattered force to Candahar without molestation.

Nevertheless, the blow at Kujhbaz had been decisive. When the Ameer at length advanced on Candahar, the two rebel chiefs, with their principal adherents, came out to meet him: all surrendered their swords, and prayed to be forgiven. So, without any further contest, the Ameer entered the city a conqueror on the 14th of June. We may pause here for a moment to remark the rapidity and completeness of the Ameer's success. A year ago he had been encompassed by four powerful rivals, any one of whom might have been backed to oust him from his inheritance. Where were they now? Ufzul Khan a captive, Shureef Khan a defeated suppliant for pardon, Ameen Khan slain, and Azim Khan a hopeless refugee among the hills on the Indian frontier.

Fortune, however, was not always to smile on the Ameer. Already her face was darkening for him on the northern horizon, beyond 'the broad, clay-laden, lone Chorasmian stream.' Abdool Rehman, with the nucleus of an invading army procured under the auspices of his royal father-in-law, left the Bokhara Court on the 22nd of June, and reached the banks of the Oxus about the 15th of July.* Fyz Mahomed, the commandant of Akcheh, first allowed him to cross the river un-

* In what strength Abdool Rehman re-entered Affghanistan is uncertain; but the constitution of his force suggests a reminiscence of Mr. Matthew Arnold's 'Sohrab and Rustum:'—

'The Tartars of the Oxus, the King's guard,
First, with black sheepskin caps and with long spears;
Large men, large steeds; who from Bokhara come
And Khiva, and ferment the milk of mares.
Next the more temperate Toorkmuns of the south,
The Tukas and the lances of Salore,
And those from Attruck and the Caspian sands;
Light men, and on light steeds, who only drink
The acrid milk of camels and their wells.
And then a swarm of wandering horse, who came
From far, and a more doubtful service own'd;
The Tartars of Ferghana, from the banks
Of the Jaxartes, men with scanty beards
And close-set skull-caps; and those wilder hordes
Who roam o'er Kipchak, and the northern waste,
Kalmuks and unkemp'd Kuzzaks, tribes who stray
Nearest the Pole, and wandering Kirghizzes,
Who come on shaggy ponies from Pamere.'

opposed, and then openly declared in his favour. Futteh Mahomed, the Governor of Balkh, hastened out of Tukhtapool to retrieve Fyz Mahomed's treachery; but the discipline of the Balkh troops, numbers of whom had belonged to Ufzul Khan's old army, went to the winds in the presence of Ufzul Khan's son sounding in their ears the popular war-cry of rescue for Ufzul Khan, and vengeance on the perfidious Ameer. They rose in mutiny, compelled Futteh Mahomed to fly for his life to Cabul, and *en masse* transferred their allegiance to the invader. Thus Abdool Rehman, without a blow, found himself master of all Balkh. Flushed with success, he began preparations for an immediate descent on Cabul, leaving the security of his base to the charge of Fyz Mahomed.

Now, Fyz Mahomed was full brother to Wullee Mahomed, whom the Ameer, when starting for Candahar, had appointed Governor of Cabul. And Wullee Mahomed's own conduct had of late not been altogether above suspicion. The Ameer, therefore, had good ground to be alarmed for the safety of his capital. His measures, however, were not equal to the occasion. Grief for the loss of his heir had deadened his perception; and instead of himself hurrying to the scene of action, he remained sunk in supine gloom at Candahar, and deputed the duty of defending Cabul to his second son, Ibrahim Khan, and his well-tried general, Mahomed Rufeek.

These joint commanders, bringing with them a large portion of the Ameer's army, arrived at Cabul on the 5th of September, and Ibrahim Khan immediately relieved Wullee Mahomed in the office of Governor of the city. Ibrahim Khan's position, with troops clamouring for arrears of pay, an empty exchequer, and not an adviser near him on whose loyalty he could rely, would have tried the resources of the most fertile genius; and Ibrahim Khan was essentially dull and irresolute. Plan after plan for stemming Abdool Rehman's advance was devised only to be laid aside; detachments started for the passes of the Hindoo Khoosh only to be recalled; and at last all hope of any greater strategy than a stand at bay before the walls of Cabul was abandoned. As if to omit no chance of ensuring his own ruin, Ibrahim Khan must needs take this opportunity to give mortal offence to his colleague, Mahomed Rufeek. Twenty-four hours after the receipt of the insult, Mahomed Rufeek rode out of the capital with a large band of retainers to cast in his lot with Abdool Rehman. So dangerous a defection moved the Ameer even in his lethargy at Candahar. He sent off reinforcements to Cabul under the command of the now pardoned Shureef Khan; not that Shureef Khan was altogether

trusted: the Ameer seems rather to have hoped, than to have trusted, that he would act faithfully. Shureef Khan reached the environs of Cabul on the 30th of November.

That same day Azim Khan, who for the last six months had been condemned by bodily sickness and want of funds to lie quiet in his mountain retreat among the Wuzeerees, made his appearance in the camp of Abdool Rehman at Bameean, where for some time past he had been eagerly expected. The aid in men or money which Azim Khan could bring to the cause of the invaders was insignificant; but his commanding ability and the prestige of his name at once gave him the lead in their councils, even to the supersession of Abdool Rehman.

Supposing Shureef Khan had been quite sincere in his new attachment to the Ameer, it still would have been but a poor fight that he and Ibrahim Khan could make, when pitted against such antagonists as Azim Khan and Mahomed Rufeek. But Shureef Khan had no intention of fighting. He deserted to the enemy ten days after his arrival. Ibrahim Khan, thus left completely in the lurch, was fain to have recourse to negotiation. And he was more fortunate in his efforts than might have been expected. The bitter cold of December stood him in good stead. The Balkh army, though now within ten miles of Cabul, and numerically far superior to Ibrahim Khan's garrison, had suffered severely from frost and snow, and, so far from being in a condition to undertake the siege of a large city, it urgently needed rest and shelter; consequently, Azim Khan was almost as desirous of an armistice as Ibrahim Khan could be. Between them it was soon arranged that there should be a suspension of hostilities until the 19th of February, during which time the Balkh army was to remain undisturbed in winter quarters in the neighbourhood of Cabul, and Ibrahim Khan was to use his best endeavours to obtain the release of Ufzul Khan and the other State prisoners whom the Ameer had in confinement at Candahar.

This lull in the troubled affairs of Cabul was employed by Shureef Khan in a succession of extraordinary intrigues. He began by ratting from the confederates back again to Ibrahim Khan. Then he made a dash at Cabul on his own account, and, being detected in the attempt, was expelled the city. His wealth enabled him to obtain readmission, and eventually he settled down as a nominal supporter of Ibrahim Khan, maintaining at the same time the closest relations with the enemy outside the walls. Ibrahim Khan, for his part, beset by treason in the palace, mutiny and desertion among the troops, and anarchy and famine throughout the city, spent the interval in

despatching repeated entreaties to his father either to release the state prisoners without delay, or to repair in person to Cabul for the rescue of the sinking kingdom. Querulous and futile orders to act more energetically against the foe were the only answer he ever received. Nothing would induce the Ameer to stir from Candahar. Buried there in the seclusion of inner chambers, he admitted none but a few personal attendants within his sight; and if at intervals he broke silence, it was only to wish, with a burst of Nero-like ferocity, that he could cut the throat of every man in Cabul and Candahar, or to declare in utter despondency that he should depart out of Affghanistan, and learn to forget his home and people in England, Russia, or the holy land of Arabia. One night he jumped into a tank, and began groping under water in search of his dead son; his guards rescued him, but he remained insensible for some time afterwards. Altogether, there was only too good ground for the rumour then prevalent throughout all the bazaars of Central Asia, Persia, and India, that Shere Ali of Affghanistan was mad.

The 19th of February 1866, the day fixed for the termination of the armistice, arrived, and Azim Khan sent a herald into Cabul to notify to Ibrahim Khan that, as the state prisoners were still unreleased, hostilities must recommence. As the Balkh army approached, Ibrahim Khan's outposts, one after another, were treacherously surrendered; and on the 22nd the main body of his troops abandoned their camp, and dispersed, some to their homes, and many more to a career of brigandage. Azim Khan took possession of the city of Cabul on the 24th, Ibrahim Khan retiring with a handful of faithful followers into the citadel of the Bala Hissar. After some days' bombardment, a guarantee of personal safety and freedom induced Ibrahim Khan to capitulate; and Azim Khan, now completely master of the whole capital, entered the Bala Hissar under a salute of forty-three guns on the 2nd of March, and held a public durbar in the Royal Garden.

The fall of Cabul electrified the Ameer. Roused in a moment from his disastrous stupor, he addressed himself to the recovery of his long-lost kingdom with a fire and determination which showed that he was thoroughly himself again. Not a trace of his late eclipse hung about him, except the deep mourning which he still continually wore. The districts of Candahar, Furrah, and Herat supplied him with troops and money, and from morning to night through all the month of March he laboured at the equipment of his army.

At Cabul, the allied princes, Azim Khan and Abdool Reh-

man, showed no backwardness in preparing for the encounter. Strategic points of obvious importance were the historic fortress of Ghuznee, on the road to Candahar, and the town of Shekhabad, lying midway between Cabul and Ghuznee. Troops were therefore promptly thrown forward to besiege Ghuznee, while the bulk of the confederate army took up a strong position at Shekhabad.

The Ameer arrived at Khelat-i-Ghilzye with a force of 9,000 infantry, 5,000 cavalry, and 25 guns, about the 20th of April. At his approach the enemy's corps before Ghuznee raised the siege of that city, and fell back on their supports at Shekhabad without firing a shot. The Ameer entered Ghuznee on the 1st of May, and halted there for a four days' rest. His star apparently was again in the ascendant. Futteh Mahomed, of whom we last heard as being driven out of Balkh by Abdool Rehman's invasion, and who subsequently had obtained the government of Jellalabad, was now in arms for the Ameer, marching manfully against Cabul from the east, and raising all the adjacent clans in his progress. But even more important than Futteh Mahomed's diversion was the jealousy and contention prevailing among the heads of the hostile camp. Abdool Rehman could not forgive Azim Khan for having jockeyed him out of the leadership. Mahomed Rufeek sighed for the superior power and consideration he had formerly enjoyed in the Ameer's durbar. And the minor Sirdars, such as Wullee Mahomed and Uslum Khan, chafed under the limitations newly imposed by Azim Khan on their rapacity and ambition, and were only biding their opportunity to change sides. The universal expectation was that in the coming struggle the Ameer would win. Veering as the wind blew, that shameless weathercock, Shureef Khan, briskly turned his back on the confederates and faced about for the Ameer: a pity he was not acquainted with the old French proverb, 'Il n'y a rien 'de certain hors l'imprévu.'

Leaving the state prisoners, Ufzul Khan and Surwar Khan, at Ghuznee, the Ameer marched northwards on the 5th of May. He came up with the enemy at Shekhabad late in the afternoon of the 9th. A cannonade was immediately opened between the two armies, which continued without much result till nightfall. Azim Khan, with the last detachment sent out from Cabul, was still nine miles to the rear of the confederate camp; but, warned by the distant booming of artillery, he pushed on with all speed to join Abdool Rehman and Mahomed Rufeek, and arrived in time to take part in the critical engagement of the following day. Early in the morning, the Ameer led in person a general

assault against the entrenchments behind which the northern army lay. The latter were kept within their defences, and ordered not to throw away their fire. In spite of this wary generalship, by which the assailants were more than once repulsed with heavy loss, the impetuosity of the Ameer and of that portion of his troops recruited from Herat and Cabul might yet have carried the day, when suddenly, at his greatest need, the whole of the men from Candahar abandoned their position and went over in a body to Ismail Khan, a prince who held high command in the confederate army, and who, as being the late Ameen Khan's son, had special claim to the attachment of all Candaharees. The Ameer now saw that his chance was gone. He turned his horse's head, and fled with four or five hundred Herat horsemen towards Ghuznee. Shureef Khan accompanied his flight. Almost all the rest of the southern army made their submission to Abdool Rehman. The Ameer's guns, elephants, and entire camp equipage became prize of war to the victors.

As soon as the issue of the battle became known at Ghuznee, the false-hearted garrison released the state prisoners who had been committed to their charge, and shut their gates in the face of the Ameer. The fallen king had to pass on without drawing rein. He halted at last at a small town called Nannee, twelve miles further south. Here the countrypeople brought him provisions, and he was joined by straggling relics of his defeated force, to the number of 2,500 men—Cabulees, Heratees, and Candaharees. He could put no trust in the Candaharees; but, calling the others round him, he told them, in tones of more than usual dignity, that what had happened was God's will, and that he knew not what might be in store for the future; that he was satisfied with their services; but that any who wished had his free permission to return to Cabul. For himself, he added, he was still Ameer of Affghanistan, and would relinquish the right only with his life. The next night when the moon rose he resumed his flight towards Khelat-i-Ghilzye and Candahar.

The confederate army made no attempt to follow up their victory. Only Abdool Rehman, with a thousand horsemen, hurried forward immediately after the battle to meet the liberated state prisoners and bring them in triumph to the camp.

With Ufzul Khan's resurrection to political life, the constitution of the northern faction passed into a new phase. Both Abdool Rehman and Azim Khan were content to compromise their mutual jealousies, and to waive their respective pretensions to the leadership, by recognising as a common superior this third prince, who stood in the relation of father to the one

and elder and full brother to the other. The subaltern chiefs had no choice but to follow suit, and the order of the day was positively agreeable to the veteran battalions from Balkh. By reason of these influences, Ufzul Khan passed at a bound from captivity to kingly power. He received the congratulations and homage of the assembled Sirdars at Shekhabad on the 16th of May, and then the camp was broken up, and the whole army returned to Cabul. Ufzul Khan was installed in the Bala Hissar as Ameer of Affghanistan on the 21st of May amid much clangour of kettle-drums, a general illumination of the city, and a salute of one hundred guns.

In the meantime the Ameer Shere Ali made good his retreat to Candahar. He was well received by the inhabitants, and, nothing daunted by his recent defeat, he forthwith set to work collecting a fresh army for the renewal of the contest. He has been incessantly engaged upon this task during the past year, and talked with confidence of being able to take the field again in two months' time. All the south and west, including the districts of Khelat-i-Ghilzye, Candahar, Ghirishk, Furrah, and Herat, were still in his possession. Shureef Khan was with him and provided the sinews of war liberally. His second surviving son, Yakoob Khan,* could be reckoned on to furnish a stout contingent from Herat. Half the chiefs in Cabul continued in secret correspondence with him. And, above all, the reputation of being the ally of the British Government was a tower of strength to him; for though, since the commencement of the strife, innumerable proofs have been given of our determination to let the Affghans fight out their own battles without the grant of a single musket or rupee to one side or the other, Sir John Lawrence has taken no less pains to let it be known throughout the length and breadth of Affghanistan

* This is the young chief who, penetrating Dr. Vambéry's disguise as a pilgrim from Constantinople, denounced that courageous traveller as an Englishman. The incident occurred in November 1863, and Vambéry, in mentioning it, portrays his interlocutor as 'a good-humoured, inexperienced child.' During the three eventful years that have since elapsed, Yakoob Khan has fairly won a title to higher estimation. Not only has he securely maintained himself in his difficult position as Governor of a newly-conquered frontier city, but, whenever called on, he has always been able to spare troops for his father's assistance. The fact is, the political atmosphere of Affghanistan, surcharged with vicissitude and peril, acts as a forcing-house on the intellects of the young Barukzyes: they shoot up into statesmen and soldiers before they have ceased to be boys.

that England does not depart lightly from her engagements, and that no pretender can hope for any countenance from her, so long as the prince whom she has once recognised as sovereign retains any material hold upon the country.

At Cabul nothing of any importance occurred after the installation of the rival Ameer, Ufzul Khan. But the prospects of the party have sensibly deteriorated in the interval. They hold nothing now but Cabul and Ghuznee; for Fyz Mahomed, who was last year left in charge of Balkh when the rest of the confederates marched to the capture of the capital, took advantage of the crisis to declare that he holds that province independent of any master. Ufzul Khan himself, demoralised by his long captivity, yielded to the temptation of sensual enjoyments, and from four in the afternoon till next morning was too intoxicated to be seen by anyone. All power centred in the hands of Azim Khan, who ruled with a tight hand, feared by many and loved by none. Abdool Rehman especially chafed under his uncle's arrogance, and it was even reported that he had quitted Cabul in disgust, at the head of a force with which he meant to wrest Balkh from Fyz Mahomed's grasp.

While the relations of the British Government with the Ameer Shere Ali remain, as we have already indicated, on the old footing of mutual trust and goodwill, the attitude Sir John Lawrence holds towards the opposite faction at Cabul is equally clear and simple, though at times it has been obscured by Azim Khan's pertinacious efforts to lure us from our fidelity to the Ameer Shere Ali's cause. Every wile within the compass of Azim Khan's crafty character has been exhausted in this attempt. His first move, essayed immediately after the capture of the capital in March last, was to work on the fears of the Indian gentleman who, though a mere news-writer, holding no diplomatic powers of any kind, is, after a fashion, the representative of the Governor-General at the Court of Cabul. In full durbar, this Moonshee being present, Azim Khan made it a practice to rail in unmeasured language against the inhospitable and ungrateful English, and to declare his intention of seeking an alliance through Bokhara with Russia. The grudge of which he made such parade, he was far from really feeling; he knew well that our policy, during his sojourn in British territory, in limiting the number of his followers and insisting that he should not abuse the privilege of asylum by intrigues across the border, had proceeded, not from any lack of goodwill to himself, but from a sense of duty towards the established government of Affgha-

nistan. His two youngest sons were in fact still in the enjoyment of British hospitality and protection. But he calculated that by an affectation of deep resentment he might possibly entrap us into a policy of conciliation terminating in actual alliance. And the ruse was not a bad one. With the British Moonshee it entirely succeeded. Fired with the ambition of doing a brilliant stroke of diplomacy for his employers, the Moonshee opened negotiations with Azim Khan, and the latter, after some show of coy reluctance, consented to make overtures of amity to the English Government. Sir John Lawrence, however, was not so easily intimidated or hoodwinked. Under his instructions, Azim Khan's letter was answered by the officer to whom it was addressed (the Commissioner on the Peshawur frontier), in that tone of unmeaning courtesy which flowery Persian is well adapted to convey; and the Moonshee received a severe reprimand, coupled with a warning that the next time he stepped beyond the letter-writing rôle he would infallibly be recalled to India. In justice, however, to the Moonshee, it must be added that he was not the only one on whom Azim Khan's vapouring imposed. The rumour of Russian influences in the Cabul durbar spread through Meshed to Teheran, and the tale, as told in Persia, was that Abdool Rehman had obtained through the mediation of Bokhara recognition from the Russian Government as Ameer of Affghanistan, on condition of vassalage to the Emperor Alexander. The credulous Persians accepted this story, ignorant of the intense jealousy with which every native statesman in Central Asia views the advance of Russia; ignorant also that for ten months past Abdool Rehman had not been north of the Oxus; and forgetful that Bokhara, through whom the unnatural alliance was said to have been cemented, was at that very time locked in a death-struggle with the battalions of the Czar. Azim Khan renewed his manœuvres as soon as the successful issue of the battle of Shekhabad left him once more at liberty to play on the Moonshee's feelings. This time he alternated direct offers of assistance with threats of downright war. First he pointed out the expediency of an alliance between England and Bokhara against Russia, and volunteered his services as a go-between to bring about the arrangement. And then again he would drop hints of having received an embassy from the Akhoond of Swat (a mysterious 'old man of the mountain' on the Indian frontier) urging him to proclaim a religious war against infidels in general and the English in particular. But his promises and his threats were alike thrown away. Sir

John Lawrence would not hold up a finger for Bokhara; and as for Azim Khan presuming to fly in the face of England and lead a fanatical descent upon Peshawur, at a time when the Ameer Shere Ali was still unconquered at Candahar, and Fyz Mahomed in open insurrection at Tukhtapool, the idea was simply laughable. Foiled at all points, Azim Khan was in the end obliged to have recourse to a more straightforward proceeding. He caused a letter to be written in the name of the titular Ameer Ufzul Khan to the Governor-General, making a plain demand for the friendship of the British Government. Sir John Lawrence's reply was as follows:—

'*To His Highness Sirdar* Mahomed Ufzul Khan, *Walee of Cabul, dated Simla,* 11*th July* 1866.

'I have received your Highness's friendly letter, giving an account of late events in Affghanistan. It has been to me a source of sincere sorrow that misfortunes such as your Highness describes have befallen the great house of the Barukzyes, and that calamities so heavy and protracted have been experienced by the people. It was, and still continues to be, the hearty desire of the British Government that the Affghan nation should remain under the strong and united rule of the Barukzye family, and that this family, endowed by the Creator of the world with wisdom to be at peace among themselves, should be respected both in their own country and by surrounding nations. Wherefore it has been a source of distress and anxiety of mind to me that strife and division have arisen among the members of your Highness's family.

'My friend! your Highness alludes to the friendship which existed between your Highness's renowned father and the British Government, and your Highness says that from this Government your Highness expects similar treatment. It is the earnest wish of the British Government that that friendship should be perpetuated. But while I am desirous that the alliance between the two Governments should be firm and lasting, it is incumbent on me to tell your Highness that it would be inconsistent with the fame and reputation of the British Government to break off its alliance with Ameer Shere Ali Khan, who has given to it no offence, so long as he retains his authority and power over a large portion of Affghanistan. That Ameer still rules in Candahar and in Herat.

'My friend! the relations of this Government are with the actual rulers of Affghanistan. If your Highness is able to consolidate your Highness's power in Cabul, and is sincerely desirous of being a friend and ally of the British Government, I shall be ready to accept your Highness as such; but I cannot break the existing engagements with Ameer Shere Ali Khan, and I must continue to treat him as the ruler of that portion of Affghanistan over which he retains control. Sincerity and fair dealing induce me to write thus plainly and openly to your Highness.'

It remains to be seen what effect this frank avowal of a preference for the Ameer Shere Ali will have in the Cabul durbar. Possibly Azim Khan may yet, in desperation, make those advances to Russia which hitherto he has only bragged of making. But we doubt his doing so; and we are confident that, if he does, he will take nothing by his motion beyond fair words. The Russian outposts, even if they had reached Samarcand, would still be 500 miles from Cabul, and the Czar, for the present at any rate, seems neither inclined nor prepared to push a man beyond the Oxus.

Such, then, is the present condition of Affghanistan, and of England's relations with the Barukzye chiefs contending for her favour. The State which, after Affghanistan, has the best claim on English attention, is Bokhara; but before we cross the Oxus to peer into the field of Russia's principal activity, it may be worth while to spare a glance sideways at Chinese Tartary. This region, lying east of Affghanistan and north of the British dependency of Cashmere, is separated from the latter by the almost impassable barrier of the Kuen Loon Mountains, and from the former by the Pamere Steppe—an extensive tract of elevated table-land, known also as the Bam-i-doonya, or Roof of the World, and occupied by the black tents of the pastoral and freebooting Kirghizzes. The vast level valley of Chinese Tartary, irrigated by rivers and canals, and rich in various minerals, including gold and coal, contains four provinces—Kashgar, Yarkund, Aksoo, and Khoten. The population is composed for the most part of a mixed breed, half Kirghiz and half Persian; besides these there are Calmucks, Chinese, and a race called Toonghanees, who, though by extraction Chinese, are by religion Mahomedans: all, as a general rule, occupy fixed habitations and follow agricultural pursuits. On Kashgar, which from its geographical position is marked out as a great centre of future trade, the Czar's Government has long fixed a covetous gaze; and although the aggrandisement of our powerful neighbour in this quarter is not likely to react injuriously on the British tenure of India, we must still confess to a certain interest in the progress of events, all steadily tending to pave the way for Russia's appearance at the northern foot of the Kara Korum Pass. Early in 1863 the Toonghanees of Khoten rose upon their Chinese masters, massacred numbers, and compelled the remainder to become converts to Islamism. Their example was soon followed by the Mahomedans of Yarkund, Aksoo, and other cities, and in this way the rule which the Court of Pekin had exercised for a century was suddenly annihilated: Chinese Tartary is Chinese now only in name.

Kashgar has fallen into the possession of a party of Kipchak refugees from Kokand, who were driven from their home across the mountains about the middle of last year, when the King of Bokhara overran Kokand and set up a nominee of his own in the government, by way of counterblow for the Russian capture of Tashkend. Yarkund is in a state of utter anarchy, the refugees from Kokand and Andijan contending for the mastery with the native Toonghanees. Khoten alone seems not to have suffered from the expulsion of the Chinese: it boasts a settled government, conducted despotically, but not unwisely, by the old chief who originated the revolution. This Khan Badshah, as he styles himself, has recently been interchanging communications with the British Government. Hearing last autumn that there was an English officer (Mr. W. H. Johnson, of the Trigonometrical Survey) employed on scientific investigations along the Cashmere frontier, he sent him an invitation to come to Ilchi, the capital of the province. Mr. Johnson, regardless of the fate which met the unfortunate M. de Schlagentweit at Kashgar in 1857, boldly accepted the invitation on his own responsibility. He met with a cordial welcome from the Khan Badshah, and after a stay of sixteen days (during which the people of Yarkund sent a deputation to him entreating him to come and be their king—so wearied are they of their intestine strife and confusion!) he* returned over the mountains in safety

* Mr. Johnson's Report (No. 102, dated 22nd April 1866 'to the 'address of the Superintendent of the Trigonometrical Survey') has recently been brought under the attention of the Royal Geographical Society. But there are two odd circumstances connected with Mr. Johnson's visit, which, as they find no mention in that very interesting paper, we may casually notice here. In the first place, a Persian Jew sought him out, and, professing to have authority for the purpose, offered to provide him employment as a Russian spy. And, secondly, Mr. Johnson imagines that the Islamised Hindoo whom he found at Khoten in command of the Khan Badshah's infantry, is capable of identification as the infamous Nana Sahib of Cawnpore. Mr. Johnson appears to have jumped to this belief from altogether insufficient premises, but it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that he is right. There is good reason for doubting whether the report of the Nana's death, circulated in 1858, had any foundation; it seems more probable that he escaped from Nepal into Thibet. And if he reached Thibet, he certainly might have wandered on into Chinese Tartary. We may also take this opportunity to observe that a valuable map of Central Asia, based on the most recent surveys that have been made by British and Russian officers, has just been issued by Colonel Walker, R.E., F.R.S., from the office of the Indian Trigonometrical Survey.

to Cashmere. The Khoten chief's object had been to obtain troops and arms from India wherewith to defend himself against the much-dreaded encroachments of Russia, and failing to find his hopes in any way furthered by Mr. Johnson's visit, he despatched a special envoy to the Governor-General of India. The envoy arrived at Calcutta in February last, bearing proposals for a defensive alliance against Russia and China, and begging that artillerymen, English officers to drill the native troops, and artificers skilled in casting guns and making swords and muskets, might accompany him back to Khoten; he was also very desirous to obtain the aid of European engineers competent to work the valuable mines of his master's country. But the requests of the poor Khan Badshah were not preferred at a favourable time. Other viceroys might perhaps have been dazzled at the sight of potentates from the end of the earth suppliant at their footstool; but Sir John Lawrence was used to strange embassies of this kind. Already more than once it had been his lot, either as Chief Commissioner of the Punjab or in his present more exalted capacity, to give audience to semi-barbarian deputies from Central Asia, entreating to be saved from the clutches of the all-absorbing *Rooss*; and to every such appeal, even though some of them came before him during the excitement of the Crimean war, he had, from motives of policy, persistently turned a deaf ear. It was not likely, therefore, that he would take other than a practical view of this latest application. He dismissed the unlucky envoy with a civil but absolute refusal on all points.

Turning our back now on Chinese Tartary, we may proceed in a north-westerly direction over the Alai Mountains into the Mawur-oo-Nahr, or the territory between the rivers Oxus and Jaxartes, belonging to Kokand and Bokhara. In the immediate vicinity, but on the left bank of the Oxus, is Khiva. Together the three Oosbeg States lie as it were in a semicircle, with Bokhara southernmost in the concave centre of the arc, Khiva at the north-western extremity, and Kokand at the north-eastern. All three, but especially Khiva and Kokand, retain an independent existence only so long as Russia pleases. Two hundred navigable miles of the Oxus are all that separate Khiva from the Russian flotilla on the Aral Sea; and Kokand, at the other extremity, is not a hundred miles from the large Russian garrison at Tashkend. Bokhara, if it had behaved with common prudence, might have remained unmolested for some time to come; but, unfortunately, the King of Bokhara pretends to rights of sovereignty acquired by recent war over a great portion of the Kokand principality, including the town

of Tashkend, and he has not had the sense to accept the inexorable logic of facts by which Tashkend, from being Kokanian, has become Russian.

In July of last year, a month after the Russians had captured the city, the King sent in an arrogant letter to General Tcherniayeff, the military governor of Toorkistan, calling on him to withdraw from Tashkend or accept the alternative of a general war to be waged in the name of the faith by all the Mahomedans of Central Asia. At the same time he marched an army into the province of Kokand, expelled the chiefs of the Kipchak tribe from the capital, and delivered the government to Khooda Yar Khan, a prince who, he thought, might be trusted to keep Russian diplomacy at arms' length. These inimical demonstrations were met at Orenburg by the detention of a caravan of Bokhara traders. The King then in turn retaliated on a Russian caravan. As if to hedge, however, against a rather doubtful issue, he qualified his challenge by despatching an ambassador named Najum-ood-deen Khan with valuable presents to St. Petersburg, to demand the release of the Bokhara subjects. He also addressed a letter to General Kryjanovski, the Governor-General of Orenburg, informing that officer of the despatch of the embassy, and proposing that, until the Czar's reply should be received, the Russian troops at Tashkend should not cross the river Chirchik. This endeavour to temporise altogether miscarried. The Russian general was in no mood to recognise the King's assumption of lordship over Kokanian territory. Besides, the rich trans-fluvial fields were really wanted as a means of providing grain for the garrison of Tashkend. A tract, therefore, of about twenty miles square on the southern bank of the Chirchik, including the forts Kiriuchi, Niazbek, and Chinaz, was promptly occupied by Russian troops, without any regard for the wishes of the Bokhara durbar. Nor did the embassy to St. Petersburg at first obtain any better treatment. Najum-ood-deen was put under restraint as a hostage at Fort Cazala, and kept there several weeks.

All at once a change came over the spirit of the Russian policy towards Bokhara. Perhaps the generals at Orenburg and Tashkend on reconsideration concluded that it would be both desirable and possible to convert Bokhara into a friend; perhaps their natural restlessness felt the check of the Emperor's sincere desire for a period of repose on the southern frontier. But whatever may have been the cause, the defiant attitude of Russia was transformed towards the close of the year into one of conciliation. Notwithstanding that Russian

traders were still in confinement at Bokhara, and that the suspension of traffic between the two countries continued in full force, Najum-ood-deen was released from Cazala and allowed to proceed on his way through Orenburg to St. Petersburg; and in November a Russian officer, with seven European attendants, arrived at Bokhara, charged with a mission to remonstrate against the King's proceedings in Kokand, and to make arrangements for a treaty of amity and peace. Now, considering the dubious character of the relations at the time subsisting between Bokhara and Russia, and the notoriously small sanctity which any ambassador's person has in the eyes of a Central Asiatic despot, we doubt whether General Tcherniayeff was altogether justified in staking several valuable lives and all the prestige of the Imperial Government upon the chances of the King of Bokhara's temper. At any rate the measure turned out ill. And if there is any truth in the assertion of the 'Journal de St. 'Petersbourg,' that General Tcherniayeff's action in this matter was precipitated by the receipt of intelligence that there were English emissaries at Bokhara intriguing to secure an alliance prejudicial to Russian interests, no better proof could be found how many a blunder Russia no less than England might be saved, if on the common ground of Central Asia the political intentions of either party were more clearly understood by the other. There was no foundation whatever for the Russian general's apprehensions. Since the day in June 1842, when our ill-fated countrymen, Stoddart and Conolly, were murdered by a former king, there has been no English agent invested with diplomatic authority of any kind at the Court of Bokhara, nor, so far as the present affords a guide for the future, is it likely that there ever will be one. India, whatever her rulers may once have thought, has neither part nor lot in Bokhara. The errand of the Russian ambassador, M. Struve, who for some time past has been employed in the double capacity of astronomer and political agent on the southern frontier, so far as it was intended to counteract the imaginary machinations of the Anglo-Indian Government, was as unnecessary as, for reasons above-mentioned, it assuredly was hazardous. The King of Bokhara, uninfluenced in the slightest degree by England, rejected the Russian approaches, and announced his determination to keep the ambassador a prisoner at Bokhara until his own representative, Najum-ood-deen, should return in safety from Orenburg.

General Tcherniayeff, on learning this result, threatened that unless the members of the Russian mission were at once voluntarily set free, he would come and deliver them by

force. Still the Bokhara Court persisted in its contumacy; whereupon the Russian general proceeded to put his threat into execution. The troops with which he started from Tashkend at the beginning of February 1866, numbered 14 companies of infantry, 600 Cossacks, and 16 guns, with 1,200 camels carrying provisions for a month. On the 16th of February, as he neared Juzak, a town fifty miles north of Samarcand, the King of Bokhara sent him a letter dated from Samarcand, consenting to yield up the captives, and assuring him that they had already started from Bokhara, and would reach Samarcand on the 17th. There was no truth in this communication; for, as we shall presently show, the envoy and his suite were still detained at Bokhara. It had the effect, however, of inducing General Tcherniayeff to halt for a time where he was. On the third day, finding that his expectations of obtaining supplies of firewood and forage by peaceable purchase from the inhabitants of Juzak were vain, and that the troops were suffering severely from the want of these necessaries, he sent out a small column, composed of two companies of infantry, 400 Cossacks, and two guns, towards the outskirts of the town, with instructions to help themselves to wood and hay, but not to use their arms unless forced into an action. The contingency he was anxious to avoid came to pass. The Bokhariot garrison of Juzak gave battle to the foraging party, and drove it back to camp with a loss of six men killed and nineteen wounded. This disaster, taken with the insufficiency of his commissariat arrangements, compelled General Tcherniayeff, on the 23rd of February, to begin a retrograde movement towards Fort Chinaz, without further waiting for the promised surrender of the Russian prisoners. For the first few miles of the retreat, swarms of Bokhariot horsemen hung about his flanks and rear, but occasional round shot kept them at a respectful distance, and on the 26th the Russian field force reached the banks of the Jaxartes in safety after an absence of about three weeks. This account of the bootless expedition to Juzak we have taken from the columns of the 'Journal de St. 'Petersbourg,' and we see no reason to question its candour and general correctness. The reports which have reached India direct from Central Asia are so manifestly exaggerated that we cannot afford them any credence.

Meanwhile, as may readily be imagined, the position of the unfortunate Russians at Bokhara had not been improved by General Tcherniayeff's ineffectual effort to enforce their liberation. Up to the 1st of February the ambassador and his suite had been kept within the four walls of their residence, but

otherwise they had encountered no indignity. On that day they were requested to deliver up their arms. They refused. In the evening the city magistrate surrounded the house with troops, and repeated the demand. The small party of Russians, with more gallantry than prudence, declined to submit, and in the fracas which ensued the magistrate and five other Bokhariots were severely wounded, and one of the pugnacious diplomatists was hurt. Attracted by the disturbance, the populace assembled in crowds about the house and clamoured for the destruction of the infidels. The Russians were then in imminent danger of being torn to pieces by an infuriated mob. They escaped this fate by at last making timely surrender to the constituted authorities. The following day they were sent off manacled in a cart to Samarcand, where the King had already taken up his quarters at the head of a considerable army.

On these events becoming known at St. Petersburgh, the Czar, we believe, expressed his strong disapproval of the line of conduct pursued by his enterprising lieutenants; he despatched a special aide-de-camp to Orenburg to insist on the adoption of a less ambitious policy; and both General Kryjanovski at the central seat of government, and General Tcherniayeff in Toorkistan, have been recalled from their respective commands. The months of March and April appear to have been spent by the King of Bokhara in braggart proclamations of a religious war, so that the Russian outposts south of the Chirchik were kept in a state of continual alarm. On the 12th of April a reconnoitring party, which General Romanovski, the successor of General Tcherniayeff, had sent out twelve miles on the road to Khojend, encountered a body of some 400 Bokhariot horsemen, escorting large flocks of sheep towards Oratepe. The Bokhariots were routed, and their sheep, to the number of 15,000 head, carried off as prize of war by the Russians. Beyond this insignificant skirmish there seems to have been little or no fighting in April. By the commencement of the following month the Russian preparations for retrieving the laurels lost by General Tcherniayeff were complete.

According to the Russian official accounts of the campaign, the estimate of 53,000 men given by the 'Levant Herald' as the strength of General Romanovski's army proves to be a considerable exaggeration. The battle in which the King of Bokhara was routed took place on the 20th of May; and the Russian troops engaged in it consisted only of a detachment from Fort Chinaz, numbering 14 companies of infantry, 500 Cossacks, and 20 guns. The Bokhariots were totally defeated; all their

artillery was captured, and the King fled in panic to Samarcand. The Russian loss was twelve men wounded. The scene of the engagement was Idjar—a place not, as we had been led to believe, on the road to Juzak and Samarcand, but on the left bank of the Jaxartes, thirty miles above Chinaz. From Idjar, General Romanovski, reinforced by a detachment from Fort Kiriuchi, advanced up the river and captured, on the 26th May, Naou, and afterwards the important city of Khojend, thereby completely isolating Kokand from the sister state of Bokhara, and establishing eighty miles of the Jaxartes, from Chinaz to Khojend, as a frontier in advance of Tashkend. At this point the expedition terminated. The Russian envoy, M. Struve (who seems to have been detained at Samarcand until after the battle of Idjar), was given up, and the King of Bokhara sued for peace. Our latest intelligence is that M. Struve has returned to the scene of his seven months' captivity in order to settle what the terms shall be, and that the terrified King of Bokhara has despatched envoys to Calcutta and Constantinople, in the vain hope of obtaining help from the English and Turkish Governments.

After the extraordinary stories which have appeared in the Indian newspapers of the capture of Samarcand, and the presence of Russian troops as far south as Shuhr-i-subz and Karshee, it is curious to find that General Romanovski's operations were confined to the valley of the Jaxartes, and that he has throughout been separated from Samarcand by about 150 miles of country, including a long waterless steppe and the Ak Tau Mountains. Russia clearly has no present wish to annex any part of Bokhara. Her next appropriations will probably be Kokand and Andijan, so as to reach the Thian Shan Mountains south of Lake Issyk Kool, and give the province of Toorkistan its natural development over that space between the meridians of 68° and 76°, in which the most recent Russian maps leave the boundary of the empire still a blank. They are based on reports received through Affghanistan—a channel which, under existing circumstances, cannot be altogether depended on for either fulness or accuracy of intelligence. The Affghan chiefs, wrapped up in their own internal quarrels, have no leisure to inquire about the blaze in their neighbour's dwelling; and what little news dribbles down spontaneously to Cabul, Azim Khan takes good care to manipulate before passing on to the Indian Moonshee. The party now in power at Cabul is, as we have already explained, bent on enticing the British Government into an alliance; and in this spirit it is Azim Khan's regular practice to paint the progress of Russia

in portentous colours, and scatter mysterious insinuations as to her widespread plots for the conquest of India.

Is it then potent still, this phantom of a Russian invasion, that Azim Khan should choose to conjure with it? Are Englishmen still haunted by the vague alarm which a quarter of a century ago hurried us into the blunder, guilt, and miserable discomfiture of the Affghan war? We answer that the old feeling still undoubtedly survives in the minds of many of our countrymen. The class fortunately is more numerous in India than in England. It includes, besides 'the panic-mongers of 'the Calcutta press,' military men whose professional instincts lead them to snuff the battle afar off, and to mistrust our existing frontier line, whether along the Indus or at the foot of the Khyber and Bolan Passes beyond that river, as false to the principles of the art of war. These are they who, to prove the possibility of invasion, cite the conquests of the Macedonian Alexander, of Timour, and of Nadir Shah, and who, in the so-called will of Peter the Great, the traditional policy of his successors, the treaty with Napoleon at Tilsit, and the immense development southward which the Siberian boundary has undoubtedly received, find cumulative evidence of Russia's determination to make the possibility an accomplished fact. According to these alarmists, what we have to expect is as follows:—In a very short time the Russians will have military colonies on the Oxus at Charjooee and at Tukhtapool. From Charjooee troops will be thrown across the desert to Merv, and from Merv the fertile banks of the Murgab offer easy access to Herat. Simultaneously a smaller column will proceed through Tukhtapool and the defiles of the Hindoo Khoosh to occupy Cabul. Persia, of course, will act in alliance with the invaders, and at Herat the force from Charjooee will be joined by large Russo-Persian reinforcements marching in from the shores of the Caspian Sea and the districts of Khorassan. Some delay must occur at Herat, for that city, as the key of the position, will have to be fortified and provisioned, and a chain of smaller forts on either side will have to be established, stretching as far as Tukhtapool in the north and Lake Seistan in the south. But the interval will be well redeemed by disarming the hostility and securing the co-operation of the Affghans. The darling dream of the whole nation is to plunder India, and Russia will offer them that guerdon, and the restoration of their old provinces of Peshawur and Cashmere to boot. Then some fine morning in early spring—unless timely measures of prevention are adopted on a scale far above the present Government's capacity to comprehend or courage to undertake

—forty thousand disciplined troops of Russia and Persia, in conjunction with a countless horde of wild Affghan auxiliaries, will be launched, resistless as an avalanche, upon the doomed plains of the southern El Dorado, and there at once is an end of our Eastern empire. Language like this is, we can assure our readers, by no means uncommon in India; and the practical remedies recommended by such speakers extend to an immediate reoccupation of all Affghanistan.

Politicians of another and far higher stamp, while they see clearly that any immediate or even proximate danger of a Russian invasion is chimerical, nevertheless look forward with uneasiness to the inevitable day when the Russian and English empires shall be conterminous, and the presence of a first-class European State on our border shall have power at any time to fan into a flame those elements of sporadic disaffection which of necessity are ever smouldering in any country won and held, as India was and is, by an alien sword. For political reasons of obvious weight, they believe that it would be in the last degree dangerous, should war arise, to have India as a battle-field; and on grounds of military strategy, they are convinced that, sooner or later, we ought to occupy certain positions beyond our present frontier as outworks of the empire. Therefore, advancing from Jacobabad, which now is our uttermost station on the Scinde border, they would proceed up the Bolan Pass through Shawl into Affghanistan, and, leaving Cabul and Ghuznee untouched, they would take possession of Candahar and eventually also of Herat, and establish at these two points fortresses of exceeding strength, to be to India what the Quadrilateral has been to Venetia, strongholds such as no invader would dream of trying to mask. And the long process of a regular siege would, it is argued, be an almost hopeless undertaking in consequence of the natural poverty of the country, the distance of the enemy from their base, and the previous destruction of the crops by the besieged. These opinions deserve to be received with the greatest respect, for they have been advocated not only by high authorities like Sir Justin Sheil and the late General John Jacob, but also, we believe, by Sir Henry Rawlinson, who, besides his large general experience of war and policy in the east, stands *facile princeps*, as Dr. Vambéry has justly testified, among all who profess a special knowledge of the present condition of Central Asia.

The majority of the British public appear to favour a third view of the question. Under the inspiration of a generous optimism rather than from any discriminative appreciation of

the dangers to which the Indian empire is obnoxious, they scout Russophobia as an exploded fallacy. In the interests of humanity they rejoice that a dayspring of Christian civilisation is spreading through the horrible blackness of barbarism in which Central Asia has hitherto been wrapped; and they positively grudge the interval that must yet elapse before India can have a neighbour whose dealings with her will be conducted on the clear principles of European good faith, and whose settled government will offer new openings for trade. Their vision of the future is the Cossack and the Sepoy lying down like lambs together on the banks of the Indus.

The present Governor-General of India has been steeped too long in the rough practice of actual statesmanship to have much faith in the advent of that political millennium when

> 'The common sense of most shall keep a fretful realm in awe,
> And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.'

But his opinions with respect to Russia, so far as they can be inferred from his public acts, tend clearly towards the conclusion which the quietists would advocate—a masterly inactivity. And we are rejoiced that this is the case, for any other course, we are convinced, would be inappropriate to the requirements of the occasion.

Were the Russian frontier pushed forward from the line of the Jaxartes to the foot of the Hindoo Khoosh—were there war in Europe between England and Russia, or even if both these contingencies came upon us at the same time, there still would be many grave reasons for pausing before we fairly committed ourselves to the project of defending the British boundary by means of an advance into Affghanistan. In the first place, there is the nature of the country and its inhabitants, both so untractable that, except in the last resort, the task of dealing with them had far better be left to a rival or an enemy than undertaken by ourselves. It is a land, in Lord Wellesley's contemptuous phrase, of 'rocks, sand, deserts, ice, and snow;' and the men it breeds are warlike, turbulent, fanatical, and perfidious. Take a small force into the country, and you are beaten; take a large one, and you are starved. Then there is the financial argument to be considered. The army that made its way up the Bolan Pass in 1839, all counted, was only 19,000 strong; yet the Affghan war cost us from first to last fifteen millions sterling. Whence is to come the money for a repetition of the experiment? As it is, the finances of India are with difficulty kept at a bare equilibrium, and the ways and means for any extraordinary expenditure could only be

provided either by an increase of taxation, or an addition to the public debt. The latter alternative manifestly hampers the resources of the empire for a future time of, perhaps, sorer need; and the dangers of popular discontent arising from the former are so great that, sooner than incur them, Lord Canning declared his readiness to dispense with the services of 10,000 English soldiers. Lastly, there can be no question that, however desirable from a strategical point of view the establishment of outworks at Candahar and Herat might be, there are, *per contra*, certain solid advantages in the present concentration of our strength on the hither side of the passes which would be forfeited, and some parlous responsibilities which would have to be incurred, in connexion with the proposed advance. For instance, the troops now quartered on our frontier are available equally for the repulse of foes from without, and for the suppression of insurrection from within; whereas every red coat despatched beyond Jacobabad, and committed a hostage to fortune among an unfriendly race, would be so much strength taken from, so much anxiety added to, the internal garrison of India. That garrison would have to be largely increased. And whence are the men to be obtained? It is no easy matter to find sufficient recruits for the English army on a peace footing, and we may well doubt whether England at any time, much less with a war on her hands in Europe, could afford to add a unit to the 70,000 men who constitute the standard of India's requirements according to existing arrangements.

But in the recent proceedings and present position of the Russians we can see nothing to call for a counter-demonstration from the Indian Government. We believe that the Emperor Alexander, apart from the necessities for quiescence imposed on him by an embarrassed exchequer, discontent in Poland, and the difficulties of carrying through the emancipation of the serfs, is positively desirous of refraining from further conquests, in order that he may have time for the consolidation of his power throughout the vast area stretching from the Aral Sea to Lake Issyk Kool. At all events, the imperial professions of a wish for peace have been openly vindicated by the disgrace of the two generals who contrived that war with Bokhara should be unavoidable. After General Tcherniayeff's repulse from Juzak and the imprisonment of the ambassador at Bokhara, Russia had no choice but to take active measures for the redress of the national honour; and the march of General Romanovski to Juzak is no more to be wondered at than our own advance two years ago, under somewhat similar circum-

stances, into Bhootan. From the slender data at our command it would be idle to speculate on the extent of the penalty which General Romanovski is likely to inflict on Bokhara; but we should not be surprised if he retired to Tashkend without insisting on any considerable cession of territory. Perhaps it may be objected that our view of Russia's pacific tendencies is good only for the life of the present Autocrat. The objection cannot be gainsaid; and, when another Emperor may arise, reproducing posssibly the traditions of the ambitious Nicholas, we shall be prepared to admit the necessity of keeping a jealous watch on Russian doings. But in the meantime we would deprecate the exhibition of a temper unwarranted by the aspect of the actual conjuncture. Moreover, if we may venture to add our contribution to those forecasts of the future which time invariably belies, we must confess to a certain scepticism as to the probabilities, at any period within the coming half-century, of Russia's penetrating south of the Hindoo Khoosh, either in warlike or peaceful guise. If we in India find it difficult, expensive, and dangerous to advance further from our resources, so must Russia. In the desolate sandy plains of Toorkistan, and among the Oosbegs of the Mawur-oo-Nahr, she has a more awkward country in which to operate, and poorer and fiercer people with whom to deal, than we have in India. She cannot afford to subsidise, and she must tax, if it is only to feed her soldiers. All the passions and prejudices of Islam are arrayed against her, and the nearer she approaches India, the worse will be her entanglement. Even those to whom she is the greatest bugbear admit by implication that it will be impossible for her to reach Herat in any appreciable strength without the active assistance of Persia, and to our thinking the day when the Shah shall have been induced into so suicidal a course will not be seen in the present generation. These difficulties must be as patent to Russia as to ourselves. Neither can she forget that, though by a concatenation of favourable circumstances, she might succeed in landing a well-ordered army at Cabul and Candahar, nothing up to that point would have been gained but the ill-will of England and the presence perhaps of English fleets in the Baltic and Black Seas. Between Russia and those rich plains, the hope of which could alone make it worth her while to enter Affghanistan, there would still be a *chevaux de frise* of bayonets, wielded by the same men who gave her a taste of their quality not long ago at Alma and at Inkermann, and who this time would be fighting on their own ground and with the perfection of military appliances at their command. Therefore we think it unlikely that for many years to come so

much as a solitary Cossack will be seen across the Oxus. Should Russia still be possessed with the earth-hunger of which she has been accused, and seek to obtain an expansion of territory for Siberia towards the genial south, we imagine that she will prefer to advance on China from the seaboard, and from the line of the Amoor, rather than on India. In the one case she will find an easy, in the other a very tough morsel to digest.

We do not shrink from the conclusion to which these arguments all point. We believe that with respect to Central Asia the Indian Government can do no wiser thing than fold its hands and sit still. By all means let it obtain information, detailed and accurate, regarding the course of events beyond the mountains; but let no decisive action of any kind be taken until England can see more clearly what there is that she should do. The materials are not wanting for the formation of an effective intelligence department. There is the news-writer at Cabul, whose diaries, on the whole, give a faithful picture of all that passes in Affghanistan; and, as regards tidings from the other States of Central Asia, there are Punjabee merchants and travellers, whose somewhat hyperbolical accounts can from time to time be checked by the despatch of specially-selected scouts. Presuming that Sir John Lawrence must have already pressed these sources of information into his service, we think there is nothing more at present to be done. We would be quiet now, in order that we may act with greater vigour when the time for action comes. Every day of peace and economy that India enjoys strengthens our moral and material hold on the country; and England may be congratulated that Sir John Lawrence has clung to this truth through good report and evil report. His policy is of too sober and practical a complexion to hit the taste of our impetuous countrymen in the tropics, who freely charge him with ignorant indifference to the perils gathering against the State in Chinese Tartary, in Affghanistan, and in Russia. But inaction in this instance is not identical with unconcern; and the people of England, recognising the difference, will prefer to hail their Viceroy in the terms of Horace's apostrophe to Mæcenas—

> 'Tu, civitatem quis deceat status,
> Curas, et Urbi sollicitus times,
> Quid Seres et regnata Cyro
> Bactra parent, Tanaisque discors.'

Art. II.—1. *Biographical Sketch of Adam Ferguson, LL.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh.* Presented to the Royal Society by John Small, M.A., Librarian to the University.

2. *Tracts by David Fergusson, Minister of Dunfermline.* Presented to the Members of the Bannatyne Club, as the contribution of the late Very Reverend John Lee, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Edinburgh.

3. *MS. Memoir of Mr. Adam Fergusson, Minister of Logierait.*

If we were asked to name a single Scotchman who should be typical of the whole race in appearance, character, tastes, and fortunes, we should not hesitate to pitch on Adam Ferguson. Hard yet kindly, hot-tempered and outspoken but very prudent and judicious, stout old Adam had many claims besides his professed stoicism to be regarded as a Scottish Cato. Do but look at him in that picture which hangs in the vestibule of the University Library at St. Andrews! He is ninety years old; but, except that time has still farther sharpened and deepened the lines of his shrewd and somewhat scornful face, he is just as Lord Cockburn described him twenty years before, when he was 'a spectacle well worth beholding.'

'His hair was silky and white; his eyes animated and light blue; his cheeks sprinkled with broken red, like autumnal apples, but fresh and healthy; his lips thin, and the under one curled. A severe paralytic attack had reduced his animal vitality, though it left no external appearance, and he required constant artificial heat. His raiment, therefore, consisted of half boots lined with fur, cloth breeches, a long cloth waistcoat with capacious pockets, a single-breasted coat, a cloth great-coat also lined with fur, and a felt hat commonly tied by a ribbon below the chin. His boots were black; but with this exception the whole coverings, including the hat, were of a Quaker grey colour, or of a whitish brown; and he generally wore the furred great-coat even within doors. When he walked forth, he used a tall staff, which he commonly held at arm's length out towards the right side; and his two coats, each buttoned by only the upper button, flowed open below, and exposed the whole of his curious and venerable figure. His gait and air were noble; his gesture slow; his look full of dignity and composed fire. He looked like a philosopher from Lapland. His palsy ought to have killed him in his fiftieth year; but rigid care enabled him to live, uncrippled either in body or mind, nearly fifty years more.' (*Memorials*, p. 49.)

The general outlines of the singularly complete, and, for a

man of letters, exceptionally eventful life, that had painted itself with such bold touches in the external aspect of the octogenarian, are well known. The spirited young chaplain of the 'Black Watch,' who disobeyed orders that he might fight in the front ranks at Fontenoy; the predecessor of Dugald Stewart in the Moral Philosophical Chair at Edinburgh; the secretary to the commission that was sent to make the last effort at conciliation during the first American war; the historian of Rome, the friend of Smith, and Hume, and Blair, and Robertson, and Gibbon,—no wonder, when he had outlived his great contemporaries, that his face read like a history, and his whole aspect was weird-like to the next age. And yet the outlines of his story, strongly marked though they were, scarcely account for the impression which his living presence produced, and which we still experience when we contemplate the portraits of him that the pen and the pencil have preserved. Though exceptionally eventful, as we have said, for a man of letters, his life, in this respect, did not approach that of many men of action who did not live half his days. It is only once or twice that he appears on the great stage of political events, and then only as a subordinate actor. He experienced no extraordinary joys or sorrows; and so far were the revolutions of his fortune from being remarkable, that he lived and died in the social position in which he was born. Even in the world of letters he does not loom very large; for he was scarcely a man of genius, and as a speculative philosopher, and even as a historian, he must be contented with a second rank. But there is one respect in which Ferguson stands out from other men. He was the very reverse of those heroes whose presence you approach with awe and reverence, and from whom you come away exclaiming 'After all!' He *was* more than he *did*. His character was of the manliest type, and its strength was felt. It is this, in an age in which ethical are so much rarer than intellectual qualities, that gives interest to the details of a life with the skeleton of which we should otherwise be satisfied, and induces us to believe that our readers will thank us for bringing under their notice the monograph which the librarian of the University of Edinburgh has compiled from sources which have not hitherto been accessible to the public.

A Scottish manse might even now, and in Ferguson's time still more than now, be described as Tacitus described Marseilles, *locum Græca comitate et provinciali parsimonia mixtum et bene compositum*. Holding something like a middle place between the well-being and refinement of a good English

rectory and the penury of an English curacy, the manses and glebes of Scotland have fostered and sent forth, from first to last, their fair share of distinguished men. Ferguson was one of the number. His father, also called Adam, was minister of the parish of Logierait in Perthshire, and he was born in the manse on June 20, 1723.

The Fergussons were descended from an old, though anything but a wealthy stock, the Fergussons of Dunfallandy, a small estate in Athole, which is still in the family; and on the paternal side they claimed, as we shall see, one of the Fathers of the Reformation. The mother of young Adam, on the other hand, Mary Gordon, was the daughter of Mr. Gordon of Hallhead, in Aberdeenshire, and 'through two 'great-grandmothers he was descended from the illustrious 'family of Argyll, much at the same distance, as his friend 'Dr. Carlyle of Inveresk reminded him, as he himself was 'from the Queensberry family.' Such is the account of his ancestry which Mr. Small has gathered from the documents before him, and it agrees substantially with that of Ferguson's earlier biographers. But another source of information still more unquestionably authentic, adds some homelier touches to the picture, and shows that if the philosopher's pedigree stretched up into the peerage in one direction, it struck down into the peasantry in another. Old Mr. Fergusson, at a very advanced age, drew up a little memoir of his life, rambling and garrulous to the last degree, but full of interest, not only from the family information which it supplies, and the indications which it affords of hereditary peculiarities, but from the light which it casts on the social condition, and, in one or two instances, even on the public history of Scotland, in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century. A copy of this curious autobiographical morsel formed part of the valuable MS. collection of the late Principal Lee, to whose son we are indebted for its use. Dr. Lee, it appears, had gathered together a number of documents relating to the Ferguson family, partly with the intention of composing a more complete life of the professor, who was his own early friend, than that which he had contributed to the Supplement to the first edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' and partly for the purpose of showing how the family of David Fergusson the reformer, had branched out in the male line to Adam Ferguson, and in the female to Principal Robertson, and through him to Lord Brougham. Dr. Laing, of the Signet Library, at the request of Dr. Lee's family, afterwards completed for the Bannatyne Club, a collection of David Fergusson's tracts which

Dr. Lee had begun; and he tells us that the establishment of these family links was long a cherished scheme with the Principal.

We ourselves are not strong in pedigrees. It always appears to us that the simplest mode of dealing with them is to believe up to the point at which it becomes desirable to call them in question, when it is generally possible to find a flaw in them with no great difficulty. If our readers are of our mind they will probably accept this document on the assurance that Dr. Lee accepted it, and they will be comforted to find that, whether true or false, it did not tempt old Mr. Fergusson to deceive either himself or his descendants as to what was the real position of his immediate progenitors. Here is the account which the simple old man gives of his birth:—

'He * was born of poor but honest religious parents, at the Bridge-end of Gernoch, near Faskelie, in the parish of Moulin, in Athol, upon the 4th day of August 1672; being the third child of Laurence Fergusson and Janet Fergusson . . . . In a year or two after his birth, his parents being, through a dearth then prevailing, unable to pay their rent, did remove to Moulin, where his father's predecessors lived for several generations, practising the smith trade, in very good reputation; the first of whom was called John, son of Fergusson of Drumachoir, who was at the battle of Pinkie, and relieved Stuart of Balnakielie from five Englishmen that were assaulting him, and gave occasion for great friendship between their posterity.'

Old Mr. Fergusson never lost the traces of his humble origin. He was, moreover, a very inferior man to his son, not only in cultivation and knowledge of the world, but in natural ability; and even if he had left a complete history of his time, would have proved no rival to his contemporary Bishop Burnet. But the sturdy truthfulness of the son's character is apparent in every line the father has written; there is an entire absence not only of all intention to deceive, but of that self-deception which vitiates so many autobiographies; and as the value of testimony is very often in an inverse ratio to the wisdom of the witness, the discovery of this humble MS. is a positive gain for the history of many questions which still agitate public opinion in Scotland. In anticipation of its publication, which we understand is contemplated, we shall cull a few extracts; and, as illustrating what we have said of its general interest, begin with the 'Sabbath Observance 'Question.' Amongst the sins of his youth with which the

* Mr. Fergusson speaks of himself always in the third person, and spells his name with a double *s*, whereas his son uses only a single one.

old man reproaches himself, 'Sabbath profanations, staying 'from ordinances, and following diversions,' hold a conspicuous place; and he illustrates them by this lively and edifying anecdote:—

'Having one Lord's day dressed up a stick in imitation of a fiddle, and rubbing the strings with a bow for his diversion, while his parents were at church, his sister Janet, a prudent discreet girl, about twelve years of age, did challenge him that it was wickedness that ought not to be done, entreating him to forbear it. He scornfully replied that he would not forbear; because he never could get his fiddle to play so well on any other day. The religious girl assured him that the reason of that was, because the devil unseen did assist him to sin against God; which had deep impression on him, so as he never forgot it.'

The impression does not appear to have been very efficacious, for, far from being better, he was considerably worse than other Christian children. He tells us he was 'given 'to lying to excuse his ill-natured tricks, swearing and cursing 'to frighten his schoolfellows, with whom he was often in 'quarrels and blows.' Still of the pious example that was set him there can be no doubt, for there is another instance of it which occurs somewhat later. When a student at St. Andrews, 'Adam' was invited to the house of one of the 'Regents' one Sunday morning (to breakfast, we shall hope). The conversation had reference to secular affairs; but Presbyterians, of the school to which Adam belonged, know how to distinguish not only between words and deeds, but amongst deeds themselves, as those of our readers know who remember the line which was drawn in a recent discussion between *cutting the ham*, and *sawing the bone;* the former action being pronounced within, and the latter without, the category of allowable acts. Adam's feelings accordingly were nowise outraged by the conversation about classes and bursaries; but—

'At the time of this communing, Mr. David Magill (the Regent) took out of his pocket a large piece of roll-tobacco, and called for (as) his servant one of the students, and ordered him to the kitchen to dry and grind it to snuff. This was a great offence to Adam, who thought his own illiberal father a better Christian than Mr. Magill, who was a preacher, because he had seen his father frequently refuse to take sneezen from persons that he suspected to have prepared it on the Lord's day!'

For good or evil, Sabbatarianism has survived; but we sometimes doubt whether the parochial-school system, of which we hear so much, exists in the same vigour in Scotland now as it did two centuries ago; and we shall see presently that the

grammar-school system certainly does not. Fergusson was sent to the parish school of Moulin. The classical attainments of his first preceptor were in accordance with what we fear is the modern type. 'He possessed no skill of the Latin tongue 'farther than the declinations and conjugations, at which he 'was very deficient;' and the system of 'dorsal discipline' which he pursued will be sufficiently indicated when we mention that his pupil's description of it has led Dr. Lee to remark, in a foot-note, that 'it appears that in 1680 little boys wore 'breeches in that part of the Highlands.' But his successor in office would have done credit to any school, even in a country where breeches had longer been the national garb:—

'About the beginning of November 1683, Mr. William Balneaves, the minister of the parish, having got notice that one Duncan Menzies, an Apin of Dull lad, who had passed his course of philosophy in the old town College of Aberdeen, was in the family of Gordon of Abergeldie in Mar, sent express for him, and he was admitted schoolmaster at Moulin. Adie, out of curiosity, going on a day to see his old comrades at the school, who had been two years before at other schools out of the country, one of them said to him, "*discumbe*," which he did not understand; and this begot in him an eager desire and resolution to go to school again, which he did communicate to his father, who, with a frown, told him, he ought not to think of that, being too far advanced in years to begin to learn Latin. But the boy would not be diverted. His father allowed him to enter at the school of Moulin the first Monday of the year 1684, where he soon went through the declinations and conjugations, of which he had some knowledge before. Duncan Menzies advanced him according to his capacity, and the month of May following he came up with those who for two years before were at other schools, and were beginning to learn Dispanter's grammar. Thus he continued at the Latin for four years, in the last of which Lord George Murray, youngest son of the Marquis of Athole, was sent to the school of Moulin; with whom Adie contracted great familiarity, treating him with more regard than any other scholar, which procured him envy and hatred from his former comrades. But, to compensate that disadvantage, he got great benefit from Lord George's familiarity, by learning from him to speak the English language, which he understood from his mother, who was daughter to the famous Earl of Derby. Lord George* was a healthy, sprightly boy. They both, in an afternoon, in a very private place, made by-signs with their hands and fingers for all the letters of the alphabet so exactly that by spelling words they could communicate their thoughts in company without the perception of any other, which was very prejudicial to Lord George's studies. For when the

* Lord George's name does not appear in the ordinary peerages. He probably died in early life.

master examined him, Adie was sure to stand opposite to him, and, with his fingers, spelled the answer to be given to every question, which made him neglect to read his lesson.'

But however it may have fared with Lord George, Adie derived great benefit from Duncan Menzies's instructions. A very affectionate relation moreover grew up between them. To procure for his master the certificates which were requisite to enable him to graduate at St. Andrews, the boy volunteered to make a journey on foot to Aberdeen in 1687; and the account of this journey furnishes one of the most amusing episodes in the narrative:—

'He was much caressed by the honest women in whose houses he had occasion to lodge, who reckoned his mother unnaturally hard-hearted for suffering so young a boy to go such a journey. In all the way he paid nothing for meat, and very little drink sufficed him; all his charges in going three score and four miles was 11*s.* Scots, and in his return the charges were scarce as much, which gave him a very favourable opinion of the people of that country, and made him treat them in a friendly manner wherever he had occasion to meet with any of them.'

In the following year he again visited Aberdeen, but this time on his own account, in order that he might compete for a bursary. On this latter occasion he carried with him two letters of recommendation — one from Mr. Balneaves, the minister of Moulin, to George Halyburton, Bishop of Aberdeen; the other from his friendly preceptor to Mr. Alexander Mitchel, one of the ministers whom the bishop had ejected from his living for refusing to take the Test. Mr. Mitchel 'entertained him at his house all the time he stayed in Aberdeen, 'performing such parts of trial as were prescribed to him;' but he not unnaturally declined to go with him to introduce him to the bishop:—

'Yet the worthy man was so kind as to accompany him to Old Aberdeen, got Mr. Geo. Fraser, the sub-principal, to introduce him to the Bishop, who was then at Aberdeen keeping a Synod, where he observed King James VII.'s birthday, on the 14th of October, in a very pompous manner, going from the divine worship at church to the bonfire at the Cross, singing psalms all the way, which gave great offence to serious tender-hearted Christians, and was indeed the last parade that profane prelate appeared in at that place; for in April thereafter the Convention of Estates having declared for the Prince of Orange, did set him and all other Scotch prelates aside, for a very flattering address they sent to King James in November before.'

Fergusson failed to obtain the bursary, and was ultimately sent to St. Andrews, and thus commenced that connexion

which his son terminated more than a century afterwards by laying his bones under the shadow of St. Regulus's tower :—

'His attempt at Aberdeen (he says) made him talked of among his father's acquaintances, by which means Patrick Balneaves, merchant in Dundee, and brother of Mr. Balneaves, minister at Moulin, having heard about him, did take occasion to recommend him to Mr. David Fergusson, minister at Strathmartin, in Angus. He was great-grandchild to David Fergusson, minister at Dumfermling, in King James VI.'s time.'

This David Fergusson was the reformer whose tracts Dr. Lee has collected ; and there can be no doubt that to his descendant Mr. Fergusson was indebted for his bursary at St. Andrews. All that he says here of the motive which induced this person to patronise him is, that 'being very clannish, he was much 'inclined to be beneficial to any of the name of Fergusson 'that was thought worthy of a liberal education.' In speaking of the regent, however, under whom he was placed, Mr. John Row, who was maternally descended from the reformer, Fergusson says expressly that 'he did reckon Adam his relation 'in that way.' Clanship and kinship, in those days, had pretty much the same value in Highland eyes; and Mr. Fergusson tells us, accordingly, that when he entered the Greek class, which was 'taken up that year by Mr. William Cowrie, 'Regent of St. Leonard's College, whose mother was of the 'name of Fergusson,' he, too, on that account, 'was very 'careful about Adam, who by his pains and diligence pleased 'him well.'

It is to be regretted that Mr. Fergusson has given no systematic account either of the studies or the social life of the university. Interesting hints, however, crop out here and there ; some of them indicating the existence of customs which we should gladly see restored. We find, for example, that Dr. Wemyss, the principal, dined daily in the hall; and that the students, as in England now, wore their gowns at table. The following anecdote, in which these facts come out, is characteristic in other respects of the Scotland of those days. The natural son of a gentleman in good circumstances, Mr. Nairn of Kirkhill, had been presented to the bursary which Fergusson's friends were endeavouring to procure for him, and they remonstrated with the principal on what they regarded as at once a scandal and a job :—

'The same day, when the principal came to the hall to dinner, he came and took hold of Thomas Nairn by the neck of his gown, and with a stern countenance said, "Rise up you Babylonish child, and let Adam Fergusson, the lawful child of an honest man, sit in that

place," which was immediately performed. Yet he gave Thomas Nairn a better place, making him his own portioner, and the students called him "Tom Babylon."'

It was some time before the wave of the revolution reached St. Andrews; but its effects were formidable when it came. In the summer of 1690 all the masters of the colleges 'adhering to King James his interest, except Mr. John Munroe, in St. Leonard's College, were deprived and turned out; and masters of the Presbyterian party were settled in their places.' Yet the institution survived, and Adam was, 'with great applause, honoured with the degree of Master of Arts upon the 21st day of July, 1693.' On quitting St. Andrews, Fergusson passed through the usual phases of a poor Scottish probationer. He succeeded his former preceptor as parish schoolmaster at Moulin, was tutor in the family of Sir Robert Laurie of Maxwelton; and finally on the 25th of September, 1700, was solemnly ordained minister of the Gospel at Craithie. The following amusing anecdote satisfactorily accounts for one of his changes of residence:—

'The school (at Moulin) being numerous, he was obliged to undergo a vast fatigue, by which he was brought so low that he was threatened with a decay, to which the following event did greatly contribute. He happened to fall into the acquaintance of a young beautiful widow; and had frequent opportunities to converse with her as a person much inclined to piety, which had such effects that he became deeply in love with her. He saw the folly of it, and used his reason against it. But the passion stifled reason, and was fed by her entertaining it, though he never told her anything about it, and she discovered her affection for him by frequently advising him to apply to his studies, and make haste to pass trials for the ministry. But, blind as he was, he saw that such an affair ought to be pursued from other motives and for another end than taking a wife, though never so much beloved. Finding himself entangled, he saw there was no way to evite death or ruin by continuing (if he continued) in the country. He, therefore, resolved to remove at (to) some distance from his beloved widow; and, to excuse his resolution to the parish of Moulin, he pretended that he was to be provided for in a more easy station, and fitter for making progress in his studies. Yet upon Mrs. —— asking whither he was to go, when he was taking leave of her, he plainly told her that "he did not know where he was going,—that he was like Jacob going over Jordan with a staff in his hand, depending on the direction of Providence!" Then she, being of a lively and religious temper, did quickly embrace him, "The God of Jacob take care of you," and so left. His friends and the parish were most unwilling to let him away, and offered to raise a salary for him. But he vigorously resisted that snare, though he was very uneasy for leaving his passionately beloved widow, who

soon after was married to a gentleman who had an income to make her live. Yet Adam retained an honourable affection for her for the space of sixty years.'

At Crathie he toiled for fourteen years with 'comfortable success,' and was then translated to Logierait, in Perthshire, on the presentation of the Duke of Athole—having previously stipulated to obtain a call, or at least a letter from heritors and people to declare their inclinations to have him to be their pastor.

The heritors having signified to the Duke their acquiescence in his appointment, Fergusson came, and we have Dr. Lee's assurance for the fact that his ministry was eminently successful. 'He discharged the duties of his laborious charge 'with exemplary piety, fidelity, and firmness; and though at 'the period of his induction the parishioners were almost uni-'versally hostile to Presbyterian principles, he speedily secured 'the respect and admiration of all ranks.'

A portion of the manuscript is here wanting, and it is left unfinished. But the concluding pages contain an account of a visit which Mr. Fergusson received in September 1715 from the famous Earl of Mar, then the leader of the rebellion, and of a conversation, very characteristic of both parties, which took place between them. The standard of rebellion had been set up at the castle of Braemar; and with a small band of not more than 300 men, partly composed of some Stirlingshire gentlemen who had joined him, Mar marched to Athole, where his numbers were soon much increased by means of the Marquis of Tulliebardine, the Duke of Athole's eldest son. In the middle of September he left his army at Moulin and came to Logierait to meet the Earl of Breadalbane.

'While he was there he called for Mr. Fergusson, being of his acquaintance when he lived in Mar. He applauded him for his prudence for not leaving the place on his coming to it as some of his brethren had done in other places, and told him that in England there was a full design to call home the King, that Lord North and Grey was at the head of 10,000 horse, that loyalty was hereditary to his family, and that none of his predecessors was more inclined to it than himself, although the state of affairs did not allow him an opportunity to declare it till the present time, that offered so fair to break the union with England and get other grievances oppressive to Scotland redressed. To all this Mr. Fergusson replied, that he did wish his family well, but was doubtful the means he was to use would in no way contribute to its support. As he was going away the Earl told him since he had the King's commission for being general of his forces in Scotland (which was not the case), he would not allow him to preach the next day, nor be his hearer, unless he

would promise to pray for the King. Mr. Fergusson assured him his lordship should not have occasion to be absent from the public worship on that account, since he always prayed for the King. Then the Earl told him he meant King James. Mr. Fergusson replied, he did not know any such king. Then his Lordship said, that he was our natural Prince, and that he had no orders from him to use any rigour to the Presbyterians, but, on the contrary, to assure them that it was in their power to secure the continuing of the government of the Church of Scotland. To which Mr. Fergusson said, that he believed that might be on the condition that they would countenance his undertaking. Just so, saith he. Then Mr. Fergusson assured him that all Presbyterians in Scotland were so deeply engaged on the opposite side, that he believed, yea, was sure, they would venture their all upon it. Then the Earl said they were great fools, and would certainly ruin themselves; and said he would employ another to preach next day in the kirk of Logierait, who should pray for the King and success to his arms. To which Mr. Fergusson replied, that that was in his power, because he had armed men to assist him; but he hoped he would employ the Lord's day as religiously as possible, which he did, by going to Moulin, where he preached.'

The MS. terminates in 1715, and pretty nearly all that we know of old Mr. Fergusson's career is that during the thirty-nine years of his long life which still remained, he retained a degree of influence which proved that his knowledge of mankind was not inferior to his zeal for their religious improvement.

To compensate perhaps for the celibacy of the priesthood, which they abhor, the Presbyterian ministers of Scotland have always been celebrated for the numbers of their children; and the minister of Logierait was no exception. Adam was the youngest of many. His birth did not occur till eight years after the period embraced by the memoir, and we know comparatively little of his childhood and youth. As usual with minister's sons, his father and the parish schoolmaster were his first instructors. He was then sent to the grammar-school of Perth, one of the ancient grammar-schools of Scotland, the neglect of which in our own day, when so much is talked and written about Scottish education, is one of the most disgraceful facts of the recent history of this country. The rector, in Ferguson's time, was Mr. James Martin, a distinguished teacher, who, though he could not boast, like one of his predecessors, Andrew Simpson, at the period of the Reformation, that he had three hundred boys, including the sons of the principal nobility and gentry, under his charge, or claim, like another, so marvellous a pupil as the Admirable Crichton, was justly proud of having instructed the great

Lord Mansfield, and, as was proved at Westminster and at Oxford, instructed him well. Both at school and at the University of St. Andrews, to which he was subsequently removed, Ferguson acquitted himself with distinction. The Perth rector long after preserved his boyish essays, and exhibited them with pride; and at college he finished his curriculum in Arts with the reputation of being one of the best classical scholars, and perhaps the ablest mathematician and metaphysician of his time.

Those of our readers who take for granted that no respectable amount of 'scholarship' is, or ever was procurable, on easier terms than the protracted and painful processes now in use, when they are told that Ferguson entered the university at fifteen, and that he carried neither Greek nor mathematics along with him, will conclude that all such statements as to his acquirements when he quitted it must be received with qualifications which would give to them a questionable value. But we are by no means sure that the conclusion is a sound one. An accurate scholar, in a strict philological sense, Ferguson never was. It did not belong to his age; his tastes did not lie in that direction; and even if they had, the events of his life would have rendered their gratification next to impossible. But there is every reason to believe that the future historian of Rome, when he took his degree at nineteen, possessed an amount of knowledge, both classical and mathematical, rare amongst those who leave the Scottish universities later, and enter them after a more laborious preparation. There is scarcely a more difficult problem connected with the higher education, than to fix the period at which the comparative self-help of the university may with advantage be substituted for the drill of the school; and in seeking to solve it we ought never to forget that our greatest men, not in Scotland alone, but in England and on the Continent, commenced their university career about the same or an earlier age than Ferguson. Milton went to Cambridge at sixteen, Bacon at thirteen, and Barrow at the same age; Hooker was sent to Oxford at fifteen, Selden and Hobbes at fourteen, Bentham at twelve, and Dr. Donne at ten, 'having at that time a good command both of the French 'and Latin tongues.' Bishop Berkley was admitted at Trinity College, Dublin, at fifteen, and Burke at fourteen. It was the same abroad. George Buchanan went to Paris at fifteen, and Hugo Grotius to Leyden before he was twelve, whilst Lagrange was actually a professor of mathematics at sixteen. All the great men of Germany of the last generation entered the universities early; and it was not till the beginning of this

century that the present gymnasial system was introduced, and that eighteen to nineteen came to be considered as the academical age. Even Goethe, whose education was a wonderfully careful and well-considered affair, was sent by his rich pedantic old father to Leipzig at the same age at which the poor highland Perthshire minister sent his son to St. Andrews. Now, putting genius and originality aside as beyond the reach of training, and altogether independent both of schools and colleges, it will not be denied that a fair share of the men whose names we have mentioned were *learned* in the sense in which we ourselves covet learning—it will not be denied that Milton or Grotius, or Buchanan were scholars, or that Lagrange or Barrow were mathematicians in the sense in which even a 'double first' or a senior wranglership indicates. How then, we shall be asked, do you explain the discrepancy? What royal road lay open to our ancestors that has been closed to us? Anything like complete explanation would carry us out of the subject of our present article. But there is one remark which we cannot refrain from throwing out in passing. Boyhood and youth are periods of human life essentially distinct: they demand treatment essentially different; and so soon as the former has passed into the latter, the arrangements inseparable from the school become inapplicable, and are not only enervating to the intellect, but deteriorating to the character.

Ferguson was intended for the Church, and, with this view, he entered the Divinity Hall at St. Andrews in 1742; but he shortly after removed to Edinburgh, and here we first find him in company with other youths whose names are historical. In conjunction with Home, the author of 'Douglas;' Robertson, the historian, afterwards principal of the university; Wedderburn, afterwards Lord Loughborough, who, though only nineteen, was already at the bar; Hugh Blair, Dr. Carlyle, and others of less note, he formed a debating society, afterwards merged in the still existing 'Speculative,' the centenary of which was recently celebrated with great magnificence under the presidency of Lord Brougham. The great period of the University of Edinburgh had scarcely commenced, and Scottish Philosophy was still in its earliest phase. Hutcheson was at Glasgow, where he was yet to be followed by Reid, of whom all that was known was the prediction of his schoolmaster, that 'he would turn out a man of good and well-wearing parts.' Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature' and 'Moral Essays' had, indeed, appeared; but, deep as was the impression which they made on Reid's mind, they had fallen all but still-born

from the press, and Hume himself was sighing for the fixed employment which he never obtained. Adam Smith was the same age as Adam Ferguson; and Dugald Stewart was not yet born.

We are not aware that any record has been preserved of the subjects discussed in the debating club of which Ferguson was a member, but the history of the Speculative Society has been printed; and an anecdote was mentioned by its venerable president, on the recent occasion to which we have referred, which may give some conception of their probable character.

'In praise of our studies, and in proof of the forwardness of our opinions in those days (said Lord Brougham), I ought to add the testimony of my eloquent and excellent friend, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was most anxious to obtain a little work that had been put out—a history of this Society, and who came to me the other day quite delighted that he had obtained it. I know that he had before seen it; a couple of years ago he saw it in my hands; and he gave it as his opinion that it was perfectly astonishing how very far forward our members were before all other persons, in these days, in the leading truths of political science.' (*Report of the Proceedings at the Commencement of the Hundredth Session of the Speculative Society*, 1863, p. 18.)

Ferguson did not long enjoy the society of those who were destined to be the friends of his later life. At the termination of only two of the six years' attendance at the 'Hall' which the rules of the Church then imposed on divinity students, by one of those strokes of aristocratic influence which too frequently interrupted the ordinary course of Scottish affairs in those days, he was appointed deputy to Mr. Murray, the brother of Lord Elibank, as chaplain to the 42nd regiment, and ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Dunkeld by special dispensation from the General Assembly.* His

* There must be some mistake about dates, both in Principal Lee's and Mr. Small's biographies. The date which they assign to Ferguson's ordination is 2nd July, 1745, a few days after which, they say, he joined his regiment in Flanders; whereas the battle of Fontenoy, at which he was present, had already taken place on the 11th May (or 30th April, old style). The probability is that he was not *ordained* till he returned from Flanders, and was appointed to the principal chaplaincy on the retirement of Mr. Murray. A similar mistake invalidates the interesting tradition that his father had sheltered in his manse at Crathie, some of the Macdonalds in their flight from the Massacre of Glencoe. Now the Massacre of Glencoe took place in 1692, and Mr. Fergusson was not ordained at Crathie till 1700. So if true at all, the story must be true of the former generation. As a third instance of the looseness with which literary

patroness on this occasion was the Duchess-Dowager of Athole, between whose family and the Fergussons a kindly relation appears to have subsisted ever since Lord George Murray and old Mr. Fergusson met as schoolboys at Moulin; but it does not appear that either friendship for him, or solicitude for the spiritual interests of the 'Black Watch,' were the motives which prompted her Grace's interference.

'Her son, Lord John Murray (says Dr. Carlyle), had obtained the colonelcy of that regiment when he was not more than twenty-two years of age, and the Duchess had imposed the very difficult task upon Ferguson, to be a kind of tutor or guardian to Lord John—that is to say, to gain his confidence, and keep him in peace with his officers, which it was difficult to do. This, however, he actually accomplished, by adding all the decorum belonging to the clerical character to the manners of a gentleman; the effect of which was that he was highly respected by the officers, and adored by his countrymen the common soldiers.' (*Carlyle's Autobiography*, p. 282.)

The battle of Fontenoy occurred almost immediately after Ferguson joined the 42nd; and it is easy to imagine that his conduct on the occasion must have endeared him to the regiment. When that marvellous column, the success of which is still quoted by military men, advanced on the enemy, the young chaplain, with a drawn broadsword in his hand, was in the front ranks of those 'Highland furies who,' as the French said, 'rushed in upon them with more violence than ever did a sea 'driven by a tempest.'* Sir Walter Scott, guided probably by the traditions of Ferguson's family, says that he was with difficulty persuaded to retire to the rear; but General David Stewart, in his 'Sketches of the Highlanders and Highland 'Regiments,' asserts that Ferguson continued with the regiment during the whole of the action, in the hottest of the fire, praying with the dying, attending the wounded, and directing them to be carried to a place of safety. As Stewart was cradled in the 42nd, there could be no better witness as to the reputation of the chaplain which survived in the corps; and this circumstance gives interest and value to Stewart's subsequent remarks as to the feelings with which Ferguson was regarded by the men.

---

work is done, we may mention that in Chambers's 'New Encyclopædia,' Ferguson is said to have been appointed chaplain of the 42nd in 1742, whereas the regiment was not embodied till 1745!

* Sir Walter Scott's Miscellaneous Prose Works, vol. xix. p. 331.

'By his fearless zeal, his intrepidity, and his friendship towards the soldiers (several of whom had been his schoolfellows at Dunkeld [?]); his amiable and cheerful manner, checking with severity when necessary, mixing among them with ease and familiarity, and being as ready as any of them with a poem or a heroic tale, he acquired an unbounded ascendancy over them; and while he was chaplain of the corps he held an equal, if not, in some respects, a greater influence over the minds of the men than the commanding-officer.' (Vol. i. p. 292.)

Ferguson heartily reciprocated the attachment of his gallant companions in arms. He served through the whole of the campaign in Flanders; was a year or two with them in Ireland; attended them on the expedition to Brittany, under General St. Clair, where, by a singular coincidence, his friend David Hume was also present; and did not quit them till they were ordered to America in 1754, nearly ten years afterwards. It was a long period of the life of such a man to have been devoted to such an occupation. But, in many ways, Ferguson was a gainer by it, even with reference to his future labours. Dr. Carlyle has remarked that, 'it turned his mind to the 'study of war, which appears in his "Roman History," where 'many of the battles are better described than by any historian 'but Polybius, who was eyewitness to so many.'*

Ferguson's acquaintance with the Gaelic language had been the pretext, rather than the ground, of his early appointment to the chaplaincy of the 42nd; and it was commemorated by his first contribution to literature—'A Sermon preached in the 'Erse Language, to H.M.'s First Highland Regiment of Foot, 'commanded by Lord John Murray, at their Cantonment at 'Camberwell, on the 18th of December, 1745, being appointed 'as a solemn Fast. Translated into English, for the Use of a 'Lady of Quality in Scotland, at whose desire it is now printed.' The lady of quality, of course, was the Duchess-Dowager of Athole, who, for the time being, was Ferguson's warm friend and admirer. But she does not seem to have stood by him very firmly; for, on his retirement from the chaplaincy, he applied unsuccessfully for a living in the gift of her son—the beautiful parish of Caputh, near Dunkeld. When his father's death occurred, the church of Logierait, which was also in the duke's gift, was not offered to him, and Ferguson, it is said, was too proud to ask it. There is reason to believe that he felt the slight very keenly; for he retired to Holland, and finally abandoned the clerical profession. Writing to Adam

* Autobiography, p. 282.

Smith from Groningen, in Oct. 1754, he requests him to address him in reply without any clerical titles, 'for I am a 'downright layman.'

Ferguson returned to Edinburgh, and in 1757 he succeeded David Hume as Keeper of the Advocates' Library and Clerk to the Faculty, in which office, as the librarian of the university, with delicate irony remarks, 'he *enjoyed*, like his predecessor, 'the moderate sum of 40*l.* per annum.' His enjoyment, happily, was brief; for the following year he accepted the appointment of tutor to the sons of Lord Bute. In the meantime, however, he had again taken root in Edinburgh. He had become a leading member of the 'Select Society,' which Allan Ramsay had established some years before, and which held its meetings in an inner chamber of the library: he had added Hailes, and Monboddo, and Sir John Dalrymple, and the elder Tytler to the number of his friends; and had taken part in the controversy regarding the morality of the stage, which the publication of 'Douglas' had excited, not only by writing a pamphlet, but by enacting Lady Randolph in the famous rehearsal in which Robertson, and Hume, and Dr. Carlyle played; and in which Dr. Blair, the minister of the High Church, acted Anna (the maid).

But now came a turning point in his fortunes. His friends —of whom Hume and Adam Smith were the staunchest— resolved to try what could be done to procure him a sphere of usefulness more suitable to his merits. The office on which they set their hearts was a chair in a Scottish university—an office for which Hume himself had twice competed in vain— and they entered on a negotiation to procure it, highly illustrative of the state of society in Scotland at that period.

Our readers are no doubt acquainted with the rival dynasties commemorated in the well-known distich:

> 'First cam the men o' mony wimples,
> In common parlance ca'd Da'rymples;
> And after them cam the Dundasses,
> Wha raide our gude Scotch lairds like asses.'

But there was an intermediate race of Scottish rulers of whom we hear less—the Fletchers of Salton; and of the Fletchers, the most prominent person, not for talents or fame certainly, but for influence, was Andrew, the great Andrew's nephew, known, when a judge, as Lord Milton. Milton's, it is true, was a vicarious authority; he was merely the 'doer' of Archibald Duke of Argyle. But he was not the less potent on that account; and Ferguson's friends knew that whilst without him nothing could be accomplished, with him all things

were possible. If his co-operation could be secured, their scheme was to bribe or force the incumbent of the Chair of the Law of Nature and Nations to resign; to bring Adam Smith, then Professor of Moral Philosophy in Glasgow, to Edinburgh, as his successor; and lastly to get Ferguson appointed to the Glasgow Chair, which being in the gift of the Senatus Academicus, it was taken for granted could be 'managed.'

The part which Lord Milton was expected to play in the plot was to *promise* that, if the bargain could be effected, the Chair of Nature and Nations, which was a Regius one, should be given to Smith; whilst the means to be applied to induce the existing occupant to relinquish the best-endowed chair in Edinburgh for 1000*l.* ('the sum he gave for it!') 'was that the town council should oblige him to attend,' which Hume says 'he would never do.' In palliation of the scheme, it may well be alleged that the public interest was sufficiently attended to in any transaction which would have secured the appointment of such men as Smith and Ferguson to offices for which they were so eminently qualified. But the amusing part of the affair is the total unconsciousness which all parties exhibit of there being anything blameworthy in withdrawing a public office from competition, and allowing it to be sold by its holder. Why the scheme miscarried we do not learn;* but had it succeeded, it would not have been a solitary case in the history of the University of Edinburgh. How thoroughly such 'arrangements' were in accordance with the spirit of the time was proved, not only by several instances recounted by Dalziel, but by what took place in Ferguson's own case the following year. In July 1759 he was appointed Professor of *natural philosophy* by the town council, 'after consultation with the ministers of the city.' The subject was one which he had never studied since he left college, for which he had neither special taste nor special aptitude, and of which he must literally have known nothing. Yet he was bound to commence his lectures in October, and had he not performed in the meantime a *tour de force* on which no man ought to calculate, a most scandalous exhibition of incapacity, and consequent revelation of jobbery, must have been the consequence. We are told that he proved fully equal

* The fact that Smith was not a member of the bar was probably regarded as an objection, all but insuperable, to his appointment to what, in a limited sense, was a professional chair; though, had he filled it, it probably would have enjoyed the brilliant fortunes which fell to the Chair of Moral Philosophy during the next half century.

to the occasion. If so, well might Hume draw a long breath, and exclaim that 'he was a greater genius than any of them, 'seeing that in three months he had learned such a science.' Though he never could have possessed any profound acquaintance with physical science, Ferguson is said to have been a more useful teacher of natural philosophy than many others who have held the chair. 'By adapting his lectures to the 'capacities of his students, he contrived to render his subject 'more attractive than it had been hitherto considered; and he 'also published for the use of his class a short analysis of his 'course.' (*Small's Biography*, p. 11.)

Even during the five years that he was Professor of Physics, his studies and occupations seem to have followed their natural bent in the direction of ethics and politics. It was then that he wrote a squib on the Scotch Militia Bill, which was attributed to Swift, and was mainly instrumental in converting the 'Select Society' into the more famous 'Poker Club,' to which nearly the whole of the celebrities of Edinburgh belonged. Two of the sons of the Earl of Warwick, Charles and Robert Greville, whose elder brother, Lord Greville, had been educated under the care of Principal Robertson, were at this time entrusted to Ferguson; and the tutor whom he employed to superintend their studies was a stalwart young Highlander, called John Macpherson, the son of the minister of Sleat, in Skye, then one of his own students, and subsequently Sir John Macpherson, who succeeded Warren Hastings as Governor-General of India. The connexion with these youths was one of the links by which Ferguson was kept in contact with the greater world. The Grevilles continued to be his friends; and of all his pupils Macpherson was the most loving and devoted. The life of this remarkable man was a positive romance—the ideal life of a Scoto-Indian; and it is strange that it has attracted so little attention. We must not be tempted to digress into it here. The reader will find a spirited sketch of it in Sir R. W. Wraxall's posthumous memoirs; and in the sequel of this paper we shall have occasion to throw light on it, and shall mention a characteristic illustration of the truth of Wraxall's assertion that '*his* purse had no strings.'

In 1764 the only position that Ferguson really desired, the only gift of external fortune that he perhaps ever coveted, fell to his share: he was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy. Ten years before, Mr. Cleghorn, then the professor, considered Ferguson so highly qualified for the office, that when on his deathbed he urged him to apply for it; and after expressing his regret that he had not influence with the patrons sufficient

to secure his appointment, added, as Ferguson sometimes related with much emotion, 'I can only say of you as Hamlet did of 'Fortinbras, "*He has my dying voice.*"' The dying voice did not prevail. Mr. Cleghorn's successor was Mr. Balfour of Pilrig; and it was by that gentleman's promotion, as it was then considered, to the Chair of Nature and Nations (which since the failure of the former attempt at negotiation had been held by Mr. Bruce, subsequently Lord Kennet), that the vacancy filled by Ferguson was effected.

It was now only that the real business of Ferguson's life began. He was forty-one years of age, and at first sight it appears as if every appointment he had held hitherto, every occupation that had been forced on him, must have tended to impede rather than advance him in his real vocation as a student of ethical and political philosophy. That such was the case with his first professorship can scarcely be doubted; and during the few years he held it he must have felt very much as if he had been 'put into one of the priests' offices in order that he might 'eat a piece of bread.' But much of his earlier training, if irregularly and indirectly, had been not the less effectually preparing him for the work on which he was now to enter. The ripe and temperate character of his exposition of human nature, and his speculations on human society, was in no small measure due to his long noviciate in the world; and if his impatience to get within the walls of an university had tempted him to enter them at first under false pretences, he lost no time in atoning for his error. He applied himself with zeal to the duties of his chair; and 'his lectures were 'attended not only by the regular students, but by the most 'distinguished men of the country.'* Nor did he content himself even with this wide field of usefulness. Very shortly after his appointment, he published his 'Essay on the History 'of Civil Society.' The amount of notice which this production attracted, both in England and in France, would be nearly incredible, if we were right in supposing that international communication began with the railway system. Hume writes him from London: 'I happened yesterday to visit a person 'three hours after a copy of your performance was opened for 'the first time in London. It was by Lord Mansfield. I 'accept the omen of its future success. He was extremely 'pleased with it; said it was perfectly well wrote; assured 'me that he would not stop a moment till he had finished it, 'and recommended it strongly to the perusal of the Arch-

* Small's Biographical Sketch.

'bishop of York, who was present.' In another letter Hume says, 'he had met with nobody who had read it who did not 'praise it. Lord Mansfield is very loud to that purpose in his 'Sunday societies. I heard Lord Chesterfield and Lord Lyt-'tleton express the same sentiment; and, what is above all, 'Caddell I am told is already projecting a second edition of 'the same quarto size.'*

The importance which is attached to mere style, and above all to the absence of Scottish idiom by men of real eminence in those days, strikes us as remarkable now when others besides the sage of Chelsea and his disciples are in no hurry to throw off the last traces of a separate nationality. In writing to Principal Robertson Hume says:—

'A few days ago I saw Mrs. Montague, who had just finished it (the book) with great pleasure. I asked her whether she was satisfied with the style? Whether it did not savour somewhat of the country? "O yes," she said, "a good deal; it seems almost impossible that any one could write such a style except a Scotchman;" and Gray says, in reply to some very unedifying remarks of Beattie's, "I have read over (but too hastily) Mr. Ferguson's book. There are uncommon strains of eloquence in it; and I was surprised to find not one single idiom of his country, I think, in the whole work."'

In Ferguson's case this envied peculiarity, for we can scarcely call it a merit, was no doubt the result of his having spent a good many of his earlier years "furth of the realm."

Many other interesting letters relating to the publication of this treatise will be found in the lives of Hume and of Lord Kames; but here is one from the Baron D'Holbach to Ferguson, which has been preserved in MS. in the University. It shows how keen was the interest with which Frenchmen then watched the progress of Scottish speculation, and is moreover very creditable to the liberality of the writer, aware, as he must have been, how profoundly Ferguson's ethical system differed from his own:—

'Sir,—I received with the deepest sense of gratitude the undeserved favour of your kind letter, dated the 3rd of March. Though your valuable work is not yet come to my hands according to the orders you were so good as to give your bookseller in London, I shall expect the favour you intended with thankfulness and even with patience; having had the good fortune of getting the perusal of

* Lord Mansfield's interest in Ferguson and his work may have been to some extent due to the fact that though not schoolfellows, for Mansfield was eighteen years older, they were fellow-pupils of the Perth grammar-school.

a copy belonging to an acquaintance of mine. I found it answering completely to the high opinion I had conceived of your great abilities and ingenuity by the testimonies given of you by Mr. Andrew Stewart, Colonel Clerk, and several other gentlemen from your country, with whom I have had the pleasure of conversing in this place. Though you don't seem to set a high value on theory, it must necessarily precede practice, and I think that given in your grand performance, by enlightening the human mind, may contribute to render their practice better, for I don't despair of the perfectibility of mankind. I believe they have been mere children in matters the most important for them. I am of opinion that the greatest part of our distresses arise from our ignorance; and, give me leave, Sir, to tell you sincerely, that I am persuaded that your valuable work is and will be very able to dispel the fogs that hang over our understandings. We are always indebted to great men for useful inventions that are the fruits of their invention and theory. What they have found out with a great deal of trouble becomes by-and-bye popular; and by degrees truth, when become general, influences the general practice, even in spite of those who think it their interest to keep mankind in the dark. As to the virtues that preserve nations, or at least put off long their decline, I believe they must be the effects of learning. When morality shall be clear or rescued from the hands of those who have made it their study to render it obscure, I think every individual will be more virtuous, and even the powerful movers of men will find their own interest in governing according to the rules of reason. I have the honour to be, with the highest consideration, yours, &c., 'D'Holbach.

'Paris: June 15th, 1767.'

The passage which led D'Holbach to think that Ferguson did not set a high value on theory is probably that in which he says, 'Many attempts have been made to analyse the dis-'positions which we have now enumerated; but one purpose of 'science, perhaps the most important, is served when the exist-'ence of a disposition is established. We are more concerned 'in its reality and in its consequences than we are in its origin 'or manner of formation.' To our mind this, and analogous passages which frequently occur in Ferguson's works, prove merely that he regarded himself in the light of a moralist and a politician, rather than a psychologist or a metaphysician—that the primary objects of his study and his teaching were the laws of *Doing*, not 'the theory of Knowing and Being,'—objects which have been too frequently forgotten by his successors in the Chairs of Moral Philosophy in Scotland. But there is another characteristic of the essay, and of Ferguson's whole tone of thinking on ethical and political subjects, which may possibly have produced this impression on the mind of a French critic. High-spirited and hopeful though he was—a believer in

the progress of the species as well as of the individual, and of the individual chiefly through the species,—Ferguson was so far from deluding himself as to the direct and immediate influence of 'design,' that some of his remarks seem almost to tend in the direction of fatalism. 'Every step and every movement 'of the multitude,' he says, 'even in what are termed enlight-'ened ages, are made with equal blindness to the future; 'and nations stumble upon establishments which are indeed 'the result of human action, but not the execution of any 'human design.'*

Yet Ferguson was no fatalist; and that he was far from depreciating theory when it is the fruit of cautious observation and correct inferences, is sufficiently demonstrated by the existence of this very essay. Though Dr. Carlyle disparages it as a juvenile production, it supplies the keynote to what, throughout life, was the spirit of Ferguson's political and ethical teaching; and, when read as a whole, may be described as an earnest and vigorous effort to call in human reason and experience to the guidance of human affairs.

Even before the publication of this essay the reputation which Mr. Ferguson possessed as a politician and a man of the world, had well-nigh put a period to his philosophical labours. In October 1766, his friend Colonel, afterwards General Clerk, brother of Sir James Clerk, of Pennicuick, wrote him from London:—

'Lord Shelburne told me one day that he supposed Governor Johnson would not perhaps return to West Florida, as he is coming home, and said that he saw no reason why he should not offer the government of it to you. I answered, that I should write to you of his kindness for you, long before it should be an object of deliberation; but that I thought you would be happier in your present situation, and more independent; for the other was uncertain, though, in the common way of thinking in the world, it was a great favour. Besides, I thought that you was of more service to mankind where you was. He laughed at me. We shall have time to consider of this. However, it shows Lord Shelburne's kindness for you, and good opinion of you. You ask my opinion upon a subject which I shall give you when at leisure.—Yours affectionately.'

Whether the offer was actually made does not appear. If made, it was not accepted; for the only events of the year 1766 were Ferguson's marriage with Miss Catherine Burnet of Aberdeenshire, the niece of his friend and colleague Professor Joseph Black—a happy marriage—which lasted some thirty years: a visit which he paid to the scenes of his boyhood in

* Essay, p. 187.

Athole: and the publication of the syllabus of his lectures. This little work he ultimately expanded into his 'Institutes of 'Moral Philosophy,' a book so useful in its day that it was translated into French, German, and Russian, and used as a text-book in several foreign universities. For the next six years Ferguson devoted himself to the duties of his chair; but in 1773 he was exposed to a temptation which would not have weighed with him had his position in Edinburgh been what an enlightened appreciation of his services, of the dignity of the office which he held, or of the public interest, ought to have made it. The guardians of the young Earl of Chesterfield, the nephew of the famous earl who had admired his essay, invited Ferguson to travel with their ward on the Continent, on terms which they left pretty much at his own making, or those of his friend Adam Smith. 'At the present 'time it may seem strange,' as Mr. Small remarks, 'that such 'a proposal should have been seriously entertained by one 'holding a professorship in the university; but the emoluments 'from his chair were at that time so small, and the terms offered 'by the earl—an allowance of 400*l.* a year during the earl's 'minority, and an annuity of 200*l.* for life—were so tempting, 'that Ferguson, not without hesitation, undertook the respon-'sibility.' To one who had led so stirring a life as Ferguson in his early years, the inducements of travel were at all times considerable. Old recollections of Flanders and Fontenoy were no doubt awakened by the mere mention of the Continent; and thirty years later we shall find him setting out to visit battlefields of his own accord. But from his letter to Smith there can be no doubt that the inadequate endowment of his chair was, on this occasion, the real ground of his acceptance of an appointment which carried him away from his family, his studies, and his duties, and involved him in a vast amount of trouble and annoyance. When this sudden resolve was taken, Ferguson was actually discharging the duties of two chairs—of his former one, that of Natural Philosophy, which was vacant by the death of his relative Mr. Russell, and his own; and the reader will learn without surprise that the patrons of the university strenuously objected to his proposal, that both should, in the middle of a session, be handed over to temporary substitutes, and ordered that Ferguson 'should teach in person during 'the remainder of the session.' With this order Ferguson complied; but immediately the session closed he joined his pupil in London, in the expectation that his absence for the next session would be sanctioned or pardoned. In this expectation he was deceived. On the 5th of April the town council, on a

motion made by the provost, 'concerning the impropriety of 'professors in the college strolling through the country as 'governors, found the office of Professor of Moral Philosophy 'vacant, and were desired to have their thoughts on a proper 'person for filling it up.' That such a proceeding should have taken place 'without any summons to Mr. Ferguson to attend, 'or any intimation whatever to him or any of his friends,' was no doubt somewhat arbitrary, and on this ground Ferguson obtained an interdict from the Court of Session against the proceedings of the council. On the merits of the case there was not much to be said; and pretty nearly all that was said by his friend Dr. Blair, and his other colleagues who espoused his cause, was, that his conduct was not without precedent, and especially 'that Sir John Pringle, who was his predecessor in 'the same chair, went abroad when in that office as physician 'to the army, and taught his class by substitute without quarrel 'until he thought proper to demit.' Ferguson probably felt that the patrons in the main were right, that his choice lay simply between returning and resigning; and he consequently confined his absence within narrower limits than he had at first contemplated. In the spring of 1776 he was again in Edinburgh. Several spirited letters written during his absence have been preserved, but we can only find space for a single extract with reference to Voltaire. The letter, like many of Ferguson's, is to Dr. Carlyle, whose singularly interesting autobiography took the public by surprise some years ago.

'My second (visit) was to Ferney, the seat of that renowned and pious apostle Voltaire, who saluted me with a compliment on a gentleman of my family who had civilised the Russians (an allusion of course to the translation of his Institutes). I owned this relation, and at this and every successive visit encouraged every attempt at conversation—even jokes against Moses, Adam and Eve, and the rest of the prophets, till I began to be considered as a person who, though true to my own faith, had no ill humour to the freedom of fancy in others. As my own compliment had come all the way from Russia, I wished to know how some of my friends would fare; but I found the old man in a state of perfect indifference to all authors except of two sorts; one, those who write panegyrics, another, who write invectives, on himself. There is a third kind, whose names he has been used to repeat fifty or sixty years, without knowing anything of them—such as Locke, Bayle, Newton, &c. I forgot his competitors for fame, of whom he is always either silent or speaks slightingly. The fact is, that he reads little or none; his mind exists by reminiscence, and by doing over and over what it has been used to do. Dictates tales, dissertations, and tragedies, even the latter with all his elegance, though not with his former

force. His conversation is among the pleasantest I ever met with; he lets you forget the superiority which the public opinion gives him, which is indeed greater than what we conceive in this island.'

The next letters in Mr. Small's collection are those which passed between Smith, Gibbon, and Ferguson with reference to their respective works, and the illness and death of their common friend David Hume. Several of these have been already printed; and we shall pass on at once to an occurrence which was a very high tribute to Ferguson's reputation for wisdom, and led to a very singular passage in the life of the philosopher. In 1775, the year before the Declaration of Independence, just when the dispute between this country and her American colonies was at the hottest, Dr. Richard Price's famous pamphlet on 'The Nature of Civil 'Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and 'Policy of the War with America,' appeared, and added fuel to the fire. Ferguson, though a decided liberal in this as in all other questions, saw much to object to in Price's mode of supporting the liberal cause; and he communicated his objections in a letter to Mr. Grey Cooper, one of the Secretaries of the Treasury. Mr. Cooper's reply was as follows:—

'Parliament Street, March 23, 1776.

'Sir,—It was my duty to have thanked you sooner for your letter, and the very masterly and judicious paper which accompanied it, and which I have read with great attention and pleasure. Dr. Price's pamphlet has been circulated with the same zeal that the Methodists circulate their manuals and practices of piety. Like base coin struck in times of disorder and confusion, it has had a value and a currency in the world which no other times would have given it. In that respect he deserves and demands what neither the weight of his arguments or the accuracy of his knowledge entitle him to expect, an answer from a good and able writer. I have ordered the observations to be printed by Mr. Strong, without its being known who is the author of them. I am happy of having this opportunity of corresponding with Professor Ferguson, and if *idem sentire de republicâ* be the basis of friendship, I can very fairly pretend to yours, for I entirely concur with you in your noble sentiment, that the great object is to lay the demon of discord, on both sides of the ocean; and I am, dear Sir, &c.,

'Grey Cooper.' *

Ferguson's reply was thus published in what is now a very rare pamphlet. He contended that though bound by their charters and original compacts to submit to parliamentary tax-

* University MSS.

ation, the altered circumstances of the Colonies now called for a change of policy on the part of the Home Government, and urged that the commissioners about to be appointed should be instructed to pursue a conciliatory policy. Reconciliation, however, and not separation, was the object to which Ferguson, in common with the English Government, still clung—an object which might have been attained had ampler powers been conferred on the first commissioners, but which the success of the Americans in the war soon rendered totally impossible. In 1778, when Lord North's conciliatory bills were introduced, and the second commission was appointed, matters had reached the point at which one course alone was open; and that the course which the instructions of the commissioners excluded, viz. the negotiation of a treaty of peace, commerce, and alliance with an independent nation. Still Ferguson was willing, if not to hope, at least to labour to avert what, in common with his countrymen in general, he deplored as a dismemberment of the British empire. When his services were requested by the commissioners—probably at the suggestion of his friend Sir William Pulteney, whose brother, Governor Johnstone, as he is commonly called, was one of their number—he readily placed them at their disposal. His appointment as secretary bears date June 6, after the arrival of the commissioners in America, and after they found that the secretary to the former commission had returned to England. But Ferguson must have accompanied them in a private capacity; for we find him in active service as secretary almost immediately after his appointment, and certainly long before he could have been sent for in those days. The first duty which the commissioners imposed on him was to convey to Congress, in person, a letter in which they set forth their powers, expressed their desire to concur in every just arrangement for the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of free intercourse between Britain and the Colonies. On reaching the outposts of the American army with this letter, Ferguson was met by the officer commanding the pickets, who informed him that he could not be allowed to proceed to head-quarters without a passport, and that this document, for which application had previously been made, could not be granted until the pleasure of Congress was known. In order that no unnecessary delay should be occasioned, it was accordingly determined to send the letter by the ordinary conveyance of the military posts; and for this purpose it was delivered on the same day to the American pickets by Lord Cathcart.

The subsequent proceedings of the commissioners, their

various proposals, and their indignant and scornful rejection by Congress, are matters of public history, and we need not dwell on them here. The only addition to what was previously known which has resulted from Mr. Small's researches is contained in the following letter from Sir William Pulteney:—

'London, 4th August, 1778.

'Dear Ferguson,—I was much obliged to you for your letter of the 19th June, which arrived a fortnight ago, and was delivered by Mr. Mackenzie. I enter into your sentiments and those of my brother concerning the unfortunate order of the 24th March (for the evacuation of Philadelphia). I have done all I can in consequence of the dispatches I have received, and I have hopes that I have not laboured in vain. I have wrote a long letter to my brother* which will give you all the information which seems to me material. Firmness, wisdom, and exertion were never more wanted for any country than now. I approve much of the letter to Government and the letter to Congress, and I believe they will meet with general approbation, though Ministers do not, I guess, relish the first, and neither have been given to the public.

'I am, dear Ferguson, most affectionately yours,

WILLIAM PULTENEY.'

Then follows this remarkable postscript:—

'I think it right to suggest to your private ear an observation or two. Though I am not surprised at the heat with which the commissioners took up the concealment of the orders, and the order itself, yet I have my doubts whether it was prudent to let it transpire in America that they disapproved of the measure, or that they were ignorant of it till they arrived. I can see many advantages which might have resulted from their appearing satisfied, but none from the contrary. It is true the misery of the departed inhabitants, and their complaints, must have made it next to impossible for the commissioners not to vindicate themselves from having had any hand in the measure; but I think it right to make this observation with a view to the future.

'I also think it would have been as well if the opinions of the commissioners had been communicated by letter to fewer persons

---

* The brother referred to is the Mr. Johnstone already mentioned who was Governor of West Florida, to whom it had been proposed that Ferguson should succeed. He was altogether the most active member of the commission, and the only one whose previous acquaintance with the country enabled him to approach the leaders of the insurrection in their individual capacity. The memorable reproof which he received from Joseph Reid will recur to many of our readers as a monument of the little success with which he resorted to what De Calliers would have considered 'la vraie ma-'nière de negocier:' 'I am not worth purchasing, but such as I am, 'the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to do it.'

here, because I think it was a piece of knowledge which ought to have been withheld from the American deputies at Paris and the Court of France. By communicating only to a few proper persons every good end of this communication might, I think, have been attained without the disadvantages. I make this observation with a view to the future.

'I have some reason to think that Dr. Franklin has acted a double part. From some facts I have heard I suspect that, notwithstanding his solemn promise to me that no use should be made of what passed between us, he did from the first make use of it to urge the French Court to a further immediate treaty, to be put over and to be ratified before the commissioners should arrive, from a fear that the Americans would certainly accept our terms. The date of the last treaty will throw light upon this when compared with the dates of my conversations with him. He was told of my arrival in Paris and my errand on Thursday the 11th March. I saw him first on Saturday the 13th, and again on Sunday the 14th. The declaration of the French ambassador here was made on Friday the 12th. I saw him again on Sunday the 29th and Monday the 30th, and for the last time on Saturday the 5th April.

'I am informed by Andrew Stewart that David Hume told him the following remarkable fact:—Hume went to visit Mr. Oswald of Dunnikier, then, I believe, a Lord of Trade: soon after Dr. Franklin came to England, which was in 1758; and as he entered the room Dr. Franklin was coming out. Hume took notice that Franklin who was just gone out was a very ingenious man. Oswald said he had been with him on business relating to the Colonies, and added these remarkable words; "he is certainly a man of genius; but if "I am not much mistaken in characters, that man has more of faction "in his mind than is sufficient to embroil any country in the world."' (*University MS.*)

On his return from this unsuccessful effort to serve his country on a great scale, Ferguson resumed his academical duties, and his preparations for the publication of his Roman History. But his progress was arrested, for a time, by what would have proved a final obstruction to any less vigorous traveller along the path of life. Towards the end of 1780 he had an attack of paralysis, probably 'occasioned by his free 'manner of living.' His recovery, and subsequent enjoyment of thirty-six years of almost uninterrupted good health, have made his case a medical *cause celèbre* for all future time. Ferguson's medical attendant was his distinguished relative, Dr. Black; and the fame of the success which had attended the great chemist in what was one of his very few medical cases, soon found its way—as all Scotch news in those days seems to have done—to Paris. The resemblance between Ferguson's attack and that which ultimately proved fatal to

Mons. de Saussure, in 1799, rendered that eminent French philosopher anxious to learn the mode which Dr. Black had pursued, and under which Ferguson had recovered:—

'De Saussure's physician, Dr. Odier, accordingly requested Dr. Marcet, then a student at the University of Edinburgh, to obtain from Dr. Black the desired information. Dr. Marcet, accompanied by Professor Dugald Stewart, waited on Dr. Black, who, after a long and interesting conversation, delivered to him in writing for transmission to De Saussure, an account of the case and its treatment, which has been printed in the "Medico-Chirurgical Transactions," vol. vii. p. 230.'

But Ferguson's fine constitution, and the Pythagorean diet which he adopted, had probably more to do with his recovery than even Dr. Black's treatment. 'Wine and animal food '(says Lord Cockburn) henceforth besought his appetite in 'vain, but huge masses of milk and vegetables disappeared 'before him. I never heard of his dining out except at his 'relation Dr. Joseph Black's, where his son Sir Adam (the 'friend of Scott) used to say it was delightful to see the two 'philosophers rioting over a boiled turnip.'

Those who delight in the curiosities of literature will probably find more pleasure than we ourselves have derived from a correspondence between Bishop Percy, Dr. Blair, and Ferguson, relative to the Ossianic controversy. Dr. Percy's allegation is, that, when on a visit to Blair in Edinburgh, one Sunday evening, 'after preaching a most eloquent sermon,' Blair 'caused him to drink tea with Dr. Ferguson,' and that he and his young relative, Lord Algernon Percy, were, then and there, hoaxed by Ferguson and by a divinity student whom he called in to recite to them a portion of the so-called epic, the said divinity student being no less a person than John Macpherson, the future Governor-General. 'Being Sunday,' says the Bishop, 'he could not decently sing the tune, which I had 'a great curiosity to hear; and, as I was obliged to leave 'Edinburgh early the next morning, and was not likely to see 'him again, he, in the evening, as we were going away, took 'me aside, and, in a low voice, hummed a few notes to me, 'as a specimen of the old Highland tune.' It is so good a story, and so little at variance with the character of the chief actor, who manifestly was Macpherson, that one almost wishes Ferguson had not denied it. Neither Percy's allegation nor Ferguson's denial ever was recalled; and the veracity of the anecdote, like the authenticity of the poem, will probably remain an open question.

In 1783, Ferguson's principal literary effort, the 'History of

'the Roman Republic,' appeared. In some respects it has not yet been superseded; and the divergence between his view of the character of Cæsar and that of a recent Imperial biographer, would afford matter for interesting comment. Our present design is not to criticise Ferguson's works, but to gather together what is new with reference to his personal history; and we shall therefore content ourselves with quoting the words in which Mr. Carlyle referred to it the other day in his rectorial address at Edinburgh. Speaking of the Greeks and Romans, he assured his enthusiastic auditors, 'I 'believe, also, you will find one important thing not much 'noted, that there was a great deal of deep religion in both 'nations. This is pointed out by the wiser kind of historians, 'and particularly by Ferguson, who is particularly well worth 'reading on Roman history.' Two years after the publication of his great work, at the comparatively early age of sixty-two, Ferguson resigned the Chair of Moral Philosophy into the hands of his friend and pupil Dugald Stewart, not from any absolute incapacity to retain it, but because he found that 'its duties 'pressed on his health and spirits.' Nominally he was transferred to the Chair of Mathematics, in conjunction with a junior professor, Mr. Playfair; but this was a mere formal arrangement to enable him to retain his salary. Of the value attached to his teaching by those of his pupils who, in after life, had opportunities of testing it on a great scale, he received, about this time, a striking proof in the shape of an offer from Sir John Macpherson to place a considerable sum of money at his disposal. The letter is too long for quotation, but if nothing else remained, either of pupil or master, few would doubt that both of them were noble fellows.

Amongst the motives which induced Ferguson to retire from his chair, one of the most prominent was his desire himself to lay before the world what he was willing to regard as the matured fruits of his speculative life. He felt that he had done what was possible to him, that he had reached the limit of his voyage of discovery; and he was anxious to return whilst he was yet able to tell his tale to the world. For doing so there was a reason in his case beyond that which ought to induce every man, if possible, to be his own interpreter to posterity:—

'When he entered on the duties of his office (he tells us) he did not set himself at once to compose a course of lectures to be read to his pupils, and thus to anticipate the labours of his future life. But conceiving that discussion and even information might come with more effect from a person that was making his own highest efforts

of disquisition and judgment than from one that might be languishing while he read or repeated a lecture previously composed, he determined, while he bestowed his utmost diligence in studying the subject, in choosing the order in which it was to be treated, and preparing himself for every successive step he was to make in his course, to have no more in writing than the heads or short notes from which he was to speak, preparing himself, however, very diligently for every particular day's work. By this means, except in so far as the particular views of his subject became familiar to him, his last year's labour was nearly as great as the first. In proportion as his notes acquired a certain form, he had them printed for the use of his students, first under different titles, but at last under the title of "Institutes of Moral Philosophy." He nevertheless experienced that the course he was to follow, even when so fixed, was subject to some variations, and as these appeared to be improvements, and served to enliven his own task with some accessions of novelty, he did not attempt to check or restrain them.' (*Preface*, p. i.)

The lectures which had thus grown up in this 'retrospect,' as he expressly called it, were published, in 1792, under the title of 'Principles of Moral and Political Science;' and into this work we must look if we would estimate his worth, and ascertain his views on the subjects on which they are best worth knowing, In speaking of his earlier essay, we remarked that Ferguson was a moralist rather than a psychologist or a metaphysician; the first thing that strikes us, on opening this *resumé* of his later teaching, is that he was a politician even more than a moralist. The most prominent characteristic of his conception of ethics is that, like Aristotle, he never failed to regard it as πολιτική τις οὖσα. He recognises the political element in the title of his work; he treats man throughout as a social being; and his ethical rules are continually illustrated by political examples. The State was the 'whetstone' to which he looked for producing that gradual approximation, not only to social but to individual perfection, which he regarded at once as the end and the law of human life. 'The difficulties and impediments which men of ability 'in opposition mutually furnish are greater than those which 'are met with in study, however abstruse, or in the practice of 'arts, however laborious and nice. In the contest of human 'abilities, invention is continually at work, obstructions are 'mutually presented, and if the genius of one person sur-'mount the difficulties opposed to him, that of another is 'employed still to supply, in the same way, some fresh occa-'sion of labour.'

On the subject of Ferguson's ethical system, and, more particularly, his theory of perfection, M. Cousin thus expresses

himself:—'We find in his method the wisdom and circum-'spection of the Scottish school, with something more mas-'culine and decisive in its results. The principle of perfection 'is a new one, at once more rational and comprehensive 'than benevolence and sympathy; and which, in our view, 'places Ferguson, as a moralist, above his predecessors.'* In this passage it seems to us that, with his usual partiality for our countrymen, the illustrious Frenchman has done somewhat more than justice to Ferguson. Viewed with reference to his predecessors in Scotland, he may be entitled to the credit for originality which M. Cousin has given him; and it is true that he makes, so far as we have observed, no reference to Wolf in the passages in which his theory of perfection is stated. Still Wolf was fifty-six years old when Ferguson was born, and he had been dead thirty-eight years before Ferguson's work was published; and if the famous maxim *perfice te ipsum* had not reached the ears of the Professor of Moral Philosophy by that time, however he may have stood in point of originality, he deserves very little credit for knowledge. Whether the principle was new with Wolf might well be questioned; but he certainly had made it his own by appropriation, to the effect of excluding all sort of claim to it by the *next* generation of philosophers. It does not appear to us, indeed, that in the region of first principles Ferguson anywhere exhibits either the depth or the acuteness of many of his contemporaries. Notwithstanding his constant practical recognition of the inseparable relation between morals and politics, it never seems to have occurred to him to question the absolute line of demarcation by which jurisprudence and ethics were commonly separated in his day. He states the distinction between perfect and imperfect obligations, without anything of the misgivings which Reid manifested with regard to it;† and notwithstanding his reverence for the publicists of antiquity, he left Brown to restore the ancient doctrine of the unity of the virtues, and by demonstrating that the limits of positive law are questions of time, place, and other circumstances, not classes of obligations ethically different, to place legislation, in all its branches, on the basis of ethics. It was only when he got out of the abstruser portions of his subject that Ferguson became great. Though his character was intensely Scotch, his intellectual organisation leaned to the English type. His strength lay not in solving difficulties, but in stepping over

* Philosophie Ecossaise, 3rd ed., p. 512.

† Hamilton's Reid, p. 643 *et seq.*

them unseen, and reaching the right conclusion sometimes even by the wrong road. Like most persons of a practical turn of mind, he probably regarded with a sort of complacency and self-gratulation what was in truth a defect. 'Far-fetched 'knowledge,' he says, 'is not the most useful, either in the 'formation of theories or in the conduct of life; and it is in 'the common course of things we must look for the rule to 'direct us in either. It is also in the most common or vulgar 'errors we have to dread the greatest danger to the peace and 'welfare of mankind.' The truth of the latter assertion, at all events, Ferguson established by an example, to the pertinency of which we have been made rather painfully alive by recent occurrences. The following sentences are very remarkable, coming as they did from the pen of a zealous Whig seventy years ago:—

'To the negative proposition, that liberty does not consist in mere exemption from restraint, we may subjoin another, That it does not consist in the equality of station or fortune. . . . In respect of sex and age, strength of body and mind, individuals are destined to inequality from their birth; and almost in the first steps of society learn the distinctions which industry and courage give in the different attainments of men, and lead, in the sequel, to all the varieties of profession and fortune. *The only respect in which all men continue for ever to be equal, is that of the equal right which every man has to defend himself; but this involves a source of much inequality in respect to the things which any one may have a right to defend.** . . . Whilst we admit, therefore, that all men have an equal right to defend themselves, we must not mistake this for an assumption that all men must have equal things to defend, or that liberty shall consist in stripping the industrious or skilful, who may have acquired much, to enrich the lazy and profligate who have acquired nothing or may have wasted all they could reach.'†

The active part of Ferguson's life was not yet over. Once more he was destined to see troops in motion, and to visit battle-fields. 'He shook hands with us boys,' says Lord Cockburn, 'one day in summer 1793,‡ on setting off in a strange 'sort of carriage, with no companion except his servant James, 'to visit Italy, for a new edition of his history. He was then 'about seventy-two, and had to pass through a good deal of 'war.' His correspondent on this occasion was the ever-

* Philosophy of the Human Mind, 10th ed., p. 615.

† Vol. ii. pp. 462–3.

‡ Lord Cockburn was not bound to be very careful about dates, but it is rather amusing to find that Mr. Small should have copied him, with Ferguson's first letter from Frankfort, bearing date 25th Sept., 1792, lying before him.

faithful Macpherson; and his letters are wonderfully fresh and spirited. The first is from Frankfort:—

'Military matters are well here, a division of French prisoners has just past, a second is expected at night, and a third to-morrow, amounting in all to about 3,000 men, taken in battle lately by the Duke of Brunswick, but I cannot learn where. . . . Let them (your letters) in the name of God come as many and as soon as possible, that is to say, much sooner than *gleich und geschwind*, which I have generally found to be as slow as possible. All I have to say for the present is that travelling even here is a very healthy business, for I thrive wonderfully upon it. . . . I sometimes torment myself with thinking what is to become of this world; but as I have no commission to govern it, the wisest course is to mind my route, and so I shall do in the best humour I can muster.'

The following passage in a letter from Venice shows how zealously he went about his own business:—

'If you remember, the Cimbri or Teutones are said to have performed wonders against Catulus the Roman general in that neighbourhood (Verona); and though it be not of much consequence whether that tale be exaggerated or no, yet I was anxious to judge of its credibility on the spot, and got on horseback from Verona for that purpose, and reconnoitred the banks of the Adige for some little way. So far I had come post; but there I fell in with a Florentine vetturino who had brought some travellers from Florence. I rode his horses at Verona, and agreed with him to drive my Titbo thing to Padua.' (*University MS.*)

Speaking of Venice, he says:—

'I could not pass this place though it is much too modern to be any object to me; I wonder at it, but am not much delighted: "si je "n'avais que soixante et dix ans," as Voltaire used to say, I would write its history with great avidity; but that is for the world to come. I went to the opera last night, and was truly entertained with the audience.' (*Ibid.*)

Since his retirement from the chair, Ferguson had occupied a villa at 'the Sciennes' near to the Grange, a region now covered by one of the most charming of the suburbs of Edinburgh. His acquaintances in Edinburgh complained of the distance, and called his house *Kamtschatka;* but he had intimate friends beside him—Principal Robertson, who then occupied the Grange House, and Lord Cockburn's father, who dwelt at Hope Park. There could scarcely have been a more appropriate abode for a *professor emeritus.* But the loss of his wife in 1795, and his growing distaste for general society, led him to seek still further seclusion, and he fixed his affections on the romantic Castle of Neidpath, on the Tweed. It was then, as now, almost a ruin, and would have been a strange

choice in any other man of seventy-two. But the selection was so much in keeping with Ferguson's character, that the proprietor, the Duke of Queensberry, was unwilling to defeat it; and readily consented that the philosopher should contest the habitation with the owls and bats, who, as he said himself, were its natural tenants. Thither, accordingly, he removed in May. As long as the summer lasted he was charmed with his abode. 'The woods, the hills, and the river are Elysian,' he wrote, 'and the atmosphere all composed of vital air.' But the winter brought trials which were almost too much even for so hardy a plant, and Ferguson's stoicism for once failed him. 'If anybody think me a philosopher, he is grievously mistaken. 'I have done nothing but *pest* and scold inwardly' (perhaps outwardly also, if Lord Cockburn may be believed) 'for three 'or four weeks, not to say months.' The consequence was, that the duke was requested to take the lease off his hands; and the following summer he removed to Hallyards, a sweet rural spot, where he lived, in the enjoyment of excellent health and much quiet felicity, for the next fourteen years, 'farming 'with all the ardour of a young agriculturist.'

Amongst the younger generation, on whose society, like other old men, he must now have been mainly dependent, one of his most frequent visitors was Scott, the companion of his son Adam; who on one of these occasions, as is well known, made the acquaintance of the 'Black Dwarf.' Ferguson's letters written from Hallyards are admirable for their sedate playfulness, and the quiet and gentle resignation which they exhibit to the growing infirmities of age:—

'What can I write from this post, at which my prime consolation is that I have nothing to do but to wait quietly till my time comes? . . . I have in my view a most delightful kirkyard, retired and green, on the bank of a running water, and facing a verdant hill, which, in your part of the world, would pass for a tremendous mountain; but to me it gives the idea of silence and solitude, away from the noise of folly; and so I fancy myself laid there, with a stone to tell the rustic moralist what he will not understand, because I sometimes project it should be in Greek, as follows: ὡς ἐγὼ τὸν κόσμον ἐθαύμασα, καὶ σὺ θεασάμενος χαῖρε; but then, again, I wish to explain it, and so it should be, "I have seen the works of God, it is "now your turn: do you behold them and rejoice."'

Would that his friend Sir Walter had contented himself even with the 'bad Greek,' in place of the ill-judged panegyric with which he disfigured the scarcely less romantic resting-place which the old man's bones found at last!

But Ferguson had not lost his interest in the affairs of a

world, his exit from which he contemplated with such manly cheerfulness. His letters from Hallyards are full of shrewd and caustic remarks on passing events. He descants on the French war; criticises Sir James Mackintosh's lecture; and mentions that having gone to Edinburgh to meet Admiral and Mrs. Nugent, 'and gratify my sense of their kindness to my 'little seaman,' he had met Sir John Sinclair, and that their meeting had led to a correspondence about his 'Statistical 'Account of Scotland.' In a subsequent letter (they are generally to Macpherson) we find the following characteristic remark: 'I shall be obliged to your German author for his pro-'longation scheme, though having annuities and salaries from 'other people, 'tis like they think I have prolonged enough.'

The revision of the proof-sheets of his 'History' was Ferguson's principal indoor occupation during these years, the only new work which he undertook being a sketch of the life of his friend Dr. Joseph Black, which was printed in 1801, as a contribution to the 'Transactions of the Royal Society.' The completion of this little work must have recalled to Ferguson the remarkable episode in his own career, when, by his appointment to the Chair of Natural Philosophy, his attention was directed to physical inquiries, for he has given a concise and interesting account of Black's discoveries of carbonic acid and latent heat, which constitute his claim to be regarded as the father of modern chemistry.

In 1808 Ferguson began to feel that the infirmities of age rendered it desirable that he should reside in a town, and he consequently transported himself to St. Andrews, the place of his own education and his father's, and the scene of many happy recollections.

During the last eight years of his life, his relish for the society of the professors in the university, and his other friends and neighbours, was as hearty as ever;* and his exultation in 1815, when he received the news of the battle of Waterloo, left no doubt of the truth of the assertion of his friend Dr.

---

* A lady, whose family were his next-door neighbours, kindly furnishes the following additional particulars. 'He wore the mi-'niature of Madame de Stäel round his neck. I have often seen 'it. I suppose he knew her well, as he did all the notable people 'of his time. . . . He had the entire English newspaper read over 'to him every blessed day by a good-natured divinity student, by 'name Charlie C. When his son John's ship was wrecked (him that 'he calls "his little seaman"), and when, coming on the notice un-'expectedly, good Charlie's voice faltered, old Adam simply said, '"Go on: read that again."'

Morehead, that 'still burned a Roman soul in Ferguson.' But the longest of human journeys must have a halting-place. In the beginning of the following February Ferguson succumbed, not, as one would have expected, to the enemy whom he had evaded so miraculously in middle life, but to a 'slight 'febrile complaint,' from which he had often recovered. After four days' illness the 'Roman soul' fled to other dwellings; but before his departure, when he had reached the very limits of time, it was strangely permitted to him to have a glimpse of eternity. His last words, as narrated to us by a friend who knew him well, are amongst the most remarkable on record. Turning to his daughters, who surrounded his deathbed, he exclaimed, 'There *is* another world!'

Art. III.—1. *Acts Local and Personal.* From the Folio Edition of the Statutes of the Realm; printed by command of His Majesty King George III., in pursuance of an Address of the House of Commons of Great Britain, from Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts. 1810–1822.

2. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Private Bill Legislation.* June: 1863.

3. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Standing Order No.* 184. Session 1866.

4. *Reports by Her Majesty's Secretaries of Embassy and Legation on the Manufactures, Commerce, &c. of the Countries in which they reside.* 1863–1866.

The Locrians, among whom it was death to propose a new law, must have been a people strangely different from the English. We seem to revel in a multiplicity of enactments. Not a few persons estimate the value of a session by the amount of fresh legislation, and conceive that Parliament has during the last two years been guilty of laches and has not contributed as it ought to swell the dimensions of the statute-books. It may afford some consolation to those who thus measure senatorial services, as the Dutch according to Addison measured female beauty, by bulk and by weight, to learn that in the session of 1865, 127, and in that of 1866, 122 Bills passed into law. They will find yet ampler satisfaction by turning to the ponderous volumes of private acts for the same years. Never, excepting in one twelvemonth at the height of the railway mania, have so many measures of this description been introduced into Parliament, never have so many received

the Royal assent, as during the last two sessions. More than thirty-six years ago Bentham inveighed against the private business system, and declared that in England one of the maxims of the governing body was 'the minimization of the 'time employed in the performance of its appropriate duties, 'and to maximize the waste of it.' He adduces as flagrant instances of a legislature mistaking its functions and throwing away its labours, the following:—

'Inquiry and decision as to a case in which property belonging to an individual is required to be transferred to the Government for some supposed preponderantly beneficial national purpose; and thence as to the quality and quantity of the compensation due. In this case the appropriate authority would be, not the supreme legislative, but the judicial.

'Taxation for the expense of works, the benefit of which is confined within the limits of particular portions of territory; say of peculiar districts. In this case a more apt authority would be, that of the sub-legislature of the district.

'So, if for any local purpose, common to some district.

'So, a transfer for a merely private purpose; the arrangement being clearly conducive to the mutual benefit of all parties; and the transfer capable of being made without detriment to the general sense of security in respect of property. Here the appropriate authority would be the judicial authority of the district.'

Having enunciated these general propositions, the philosophical reformer continues:—

'Of waste committed in the above shapes, exemplification, to a vast extent, may be at all times seen in English practice; and by the magnitude and uncertainty of the number of members present, added to the irresponsibility of their situation (this judicatory being, as to all points of appropriate aptitude, rendered notoriously in the highest degree unapt, and in particular in respect of moral aptitude —in one word, by corruption), a constant waste of legislative time is frequently accompanied by the evil of misjudication.

'English practice affords another example which is somewhat remarkable, namely, the grant or refusal by Parliament, of the dissolution of the contract between husband and wife.'

Since the 'Constitutional Code' was published much has been accomplished in the direction its author indicated. 'The cor-'ruption and inaptitude' arising from open committees has disappeared; questions of Divorce, Naturalisation, Enfranchisement, Inclosure, Drainage, Pilotage, the construction or improvement of Piers and Harbours, the regulation of Turnpike Trusts, have been almost, or altogether, withdrawn from Parliament and entrusted to commissioners or permanent tribunals. The incorporation, regulation, and the winding up of

Joint Stock Companies, leases and sale of settled properties in many cases, the sale of Encumbered Estates in Ireland, the barring of entails in Scotland, have been in the main provided for by general Acts. The Poor Law Amendment, the Public Health and Local Government Acts, the County Courts and Constabulary Acts, have also dispensed with a multitude of local statutes. Finally, General and Consolidation Acts have abridged and simplified the labours of Parliament in regard to those subjects over which it retains immediate control. Nevertheless the private business of the House continues to increase. In Bentham's time the number of private acts did not on an average exceed 160 a year. Last session the number of Bills submitted for the approbation of Parliament was 648, of which 377 became law, while in the session of 1865 even this number was exceeded, and no less than 392 private acts received the Royal assent. Moreover, from a return recently laid before the House of Commons, it appears that for the last seventeen years there has been a steady and progressive increase in this class of business; and although, owing to the state of the money-market, and other exceptional circumstances, it may in particular years show a decline, there is no reason to suppose that it will not continue to grow with the wealth and enterprise of the country.*

Parliament, loath to part with its jurisdiction, has called in the aid of Examiners, has had recourse to panels of Chairmen, has reduced the quorum and multiplied the number of its committees, has divided and sub-divided inquiries and remitted some to the Chairman of Ways and Means, and others to the new Courts of Referees, but all in vain;

> 'Non Hydra secto corpore fortior
> Vinci dolentem crevit in Herculem.'

The private business, lopped and shorn of all the heads we have enumerated, attacked with all the weapons we have described, has risen up each successive year more formidable than before. If ever a Reform Bill proposes to add to the number of members of the legislature, one of the arguments in favour of the innovation will be found in the despair of procuring sufficient strength to grapple with this branch of its duties.

---

* For the ten years preceding the railway mania, namely, from 1835 to 1845, the number of Private Acts annually passed varied from 120 to 150, in 1845 the number rose to 213, in 1846 it was 404, in 1847, 339; in 1849 the number had reverted to the former level and was 132; from that time it has gradually increased to the amount shown above.

Before entering upon the consideration of the difficulties with which this department of legislation is beset, and the remedies which may be applied, it may be well briefly to advert to its origin and early history.

Acts affecting only particular persons and localities are in their nature exceptions from law, and have their source not in respect for, but in impatience of, rule and order. They were first employed by successive factions and usurpers as weapons to oppress and crush their rivals, and as ready instruments to feed the rapacity of their creatures, or to reward traitors and renegades. The earliest we have noticed is levelled, not against the living, but the dead. It bears the date of 1266, and under penalties ecclesiastical and temporal, prohibits 'any 'man from holding Simon Earl of Leicester for a saint or a 'just one, for that he died under excommunication according 'to the doctrine of Holy Church;' and further provides that 'the vain and foolish miracles related of him by certain persons 'shall not pass men's lips.' A more serious penalty, according to modern notions, is by an Act of the same year imposed upon the Earl de Ferris, who is 'punished by as much as the 'value of his lands shall amount unto in seven years.' Magna Charta had stipulated that freemen should be exiled by law only. We are not, therefore, surprised to find Acts of banishment among the earliest specimens of personal legislation. By the 15 Edward II., Sir Hugh Le Despencer the father, and Sir Hugh Le Despencer the son, were banished the realm for 'accroaching the Royal Power, and not suffering the great 'men of the realm nor the good counsellors of the King to 'speak with the King, nor the King to speak with them.' Lady de Vescy was considered by her rivals formidable enough to be made the subject of a similar Act in the same reign, which, however, banished her, not from the kingdom, but only from the Court. The first complete Act of attainder we have observed is one of Henry VI., whereby, 'the most abominable 'tyrant, horrible, odious, and errant false traitor, John Cade, 'calling and naming himself sometime Mortimer, sometime 'Captain of Kent, which name, fame, acts and feats, be to be 'removed out of the speech and mind of every faithful Chris-'tian man perpetually,' was attainted of treason, his goods forfeited, and 'his blood declared corrupt and disabled for ever.' Under Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Acts of attainder, reversals of attainder, and renewals of attainder, become almost as plentiful as road and inclosure Acts under George III., or railway Acts under Queen Victoria.

The Record Commission classes Acts of attainder and of

pains and penalties among private or personal Acts; but in recent times private Acts are understood to be laws granting special powers, privileges, or immunities to or for the benefit of particular persons, bodies, or localities, and in consequence solicited by the parties interested. According to this definition an Act of Edward II. restoring the Despencers to their country and honours, and another in the same reign for the naturalisation of Lady de Bryan and others, are entitled to be considered the first private Acts. Dover and Calais are the objects of the earliest local statutes. The first, in the reign of Edward I., defines the jurisdiction of the Constable of Dover Castle; the other, in the reign of Edward III., relates to the wool-staple at the French port. If we may judge from a precedent cited by Selden, the bonds of matrimony could in early times be dissolved by a process more prompt and economical than any Sir James Wilde and the new Divorce Court can offer. In the reign of Edward I., John de Camoys by formal deed of gift, duly attested by two witnesses, gave and granted his wife, together with certain property, to William Paynel. The proceeding, however, appears to have been an unusual one and its validity to have been questioned at the time.* Orthodox Roman Catholics had recourse in their domestic troubles to the dispensing power of the Pope; Protestantism having cut itself off from this remedy, took refuge in divorce Acts. Henry VIII. and his Parliaments paved the way by declaring his marriage with Katherine of Aragon null and void. Subsequently, growing somewhat bolder, they passed an 'Act for the dissolution 'of the pretended marriage with the Lady Anne of Cleves.' In the case of 'Mrs. Katherine Howard' the knot was cut by an Act for her death and attainder; and it was reserved for Lady Northampton, in the following reign, to have the honour of being the subject of the first divorce Act on record severing an acknowledged and undisputed tie.

The first of thousands of Road Acts appears under Henry V. With primitive simplicity it provides for the repair of the road established—one from Abingdon to Dorchester—by commending it to the liberality of the well-disposed. The earliest Waterworks Act occurs in 1543; it authorised the Mayor and Commonalty of London to bring water for the use of the City from Hampstead, Marylebone, and Hackney, and gave them the

* For a copy of this document, and a detailed account of the proceedings to which it gave rise, see Selden's 'Uxor Ebraica,' book iii. c. 30.

remarkable power of entering upon private ground, to dig for water wherever they had reasonable expectation of finding it.

Acts for the 'Inning,' or embanking, and drainage of Marsh-lands commence with the Tudors, as do also estate Acts. Turnpike trusts and inclosures followed with the Stuarts subsequently to their Restoration. After the Revolution came local Acts for the relief of the poor and the erection of workhouses, Bristol, Hereford, and Tiverton leading the way under William III. Canal Acts had their beginning under the second George, gas Acts under the third, and railway Acts under the fourth. From these beginnings private Acts for various purposes have grown and multiplied, till at the present time the total number on the statute-books is not far short of 30,000.

The functions of Parliament in regard to this important class of measures are held to be both legislative and judicial, but in various proportions according to the character and object of the Bill proposed. Bentham appears to have considered these functions as in every case solely, or chiefly, of a judicial nature. They are certainly such in regard to divorces, and divorces may therefore be most properly dealt with by a court of law. Again, the questions involved in inclosure and local Acts may well be entrusted to Commissioners or to some other fixed body. Gas Companies do not usually require to take lands compulsorily, but only authority to break up roads and streets for the purpose of public and private service. We are disposed to think that Parliament might advantageously relieve itself of this portion of its labours, and, subject to the provisions of a General Act, remit to a government department, and to local authorities the right of conceding the requisite powers. So also, in very many cases, in respect of waterworks. Legislation in these matters is, moreover, facilitated by the growing disposition to entrust such undertakings to municipal or other responsible bodies, and to execute them at the public cost of the locality to be served. But in the case of Railways, the legislative character of the duties of Parliament predominates, and since Bentham's time railways have become the principal subjects of private Bills. Out of 392 such Acts passed in 1865, not less than 256 were railway Acts; of 630 sittings held by the Committees of the House of Commons and the Referees in the same session more than four-fifths were devoted to this branch alone.

Law, as we all heard, is a bottomless pit; but if we may credit much of the evidence given before the Select Committees named at the head of this article, and before many others, a

parliamentary contest is a still more immeasurable abyss than a chancery suit as described by Swift. The fierce and costly character of the battles waged between rival companies, territorial magnates, and leviathan speculators, the utter uncertainty of the event, owing to the ever-varying and often inconsistent decisions of Committees, countenance the notion that these struggles are the modern type of the wars of the feudal barons in a ruder and more primitive age.

Parliament, however, cannot be accused of being blind to the defects of the present legislation, or averse to considering schemes for its amendment. The course of reformers of private Business is as thickly strewn with wrecks as is that of reformers of the representation of the people. Thus, there have been proposals for Parliamentary Boards, for non-parliamentary Boards, for mixed Boards; proposals for preliminary inquiries, for auxiliary inquiries, for conditional inquiries; for tribunals whose findings should be provisional, for tribunals whose findings should be conclusive; Peers and Commoners, officials, agents, barristers, volunteers of every description, have contributed to the mass of abortive plans which lie imbedded in the strata of reports deposited by a long succession of Committees. The Blue Book which was the result of the labours of the Committee of 1863 sufficiently illustrates the hopeless diversity of opinion that prevails. That Committee consisted of fifteen members, by whom, after the evidence had closed, twelve different reports or sets of resolutions were submitted for approval. Thirteen witnesses were examined as to the conduct of private business, who proposed minor twelve different schemes of reform, besides making innumerable suggestions. Finally the Committee reviewed twelve propositions for improving or superseding inquiries by Parliamentary Committees; of these it condemned eleven, and the twelfth, which it approved, has never been adopted by either House. The cause of the failure of so many attempts at reform is not far to seek. Railways present the great difficulty, and the public does not know its own mind about railways. Mr. Buxton might well have included in his remarkable little work on the floating and unsettled ideas of the day, those on railway policy. Indeed, the writer of a text-book on logic would find a fertile field for illustrating the doctrine of contradictories, contraries, and sub-contraries, in the different theories held on this subject. Parliament, on the other hand, knows what it wants, but then it wants an impossibility—namely, to retain its jurisdiction over private Bills, and at the same time to be relieved of a laborious and distasteful task.

When the iron roads were first introduced, the world in its

simplicity assumed them to be highways, the use of which would be enjoyed by all the king's lieges. To this day the legislature countenances the delusion, and inserts in all railway Bills elaborate clauses enacting the tolls on payment of which any person may travel over the line with his own engine and carriage. A further consequence of this assumption has been that railway companies are in great measure exempt from the provisions of the winding-up Acts; that they cannot be made bankrupt and their line disposed of to the highest bidder. At the same time their rolling stock may be swept off and sold for the benefit of creditors, and traffic thus effectually arrested. Before long Companies, finding themselves *de facto* masters of a territory, began, like other despots, to assert that they were such *de jure*. Few now-a-days, except railway directors, have the hardihood nakedly to maintain this divine right of Companies; but protectionist instincts, and a just respect for vested interests, combine covertly to foster and spread the doctrine. On the other hand, many who feel scant regard for established companies, accept as an oracle Stephenson's dictum that, 'where combination is possible competition is impossible.' They submit to regulated monopoly as a lesser evil than imperfect free trade, and would rather entrust a district to the self-interest and self-respect of one flourishing company, than fish in troubled waters and depend for accommodation upon the bickerings of two or three rival associations. The fanatics of consistency assert that railways have no title to protection above land, shipping, or manufactures, but do not stop to realise how far competition is or is not possible. Others again, who perceive that the supply of railways in a country cannot be unlimited, yet would have free trade as far as ever the case admits, and by using it, now as a threat, now as a real weapon of offence, make shift to control and coerce exacting and refractory companies. Political economy itself appears at fault when it approaches the subject of railways. A Committee, presided over by no less a person than Mr. Gladstone, laid it down in 1844 as an axiom, that works unremunerative to the promoters are of no advantage to the public. An opposite school dogmatically contends, that whether a line ruins its contractors and beggars its shareholders or not, is a question of no consequence but to themselves, and that the cost of a railway to the country is to be measured solely by the amount expended on land, labour, and materials, irrespective of the terms on which the capital for making it is procured. Eclectics take a distinction, and argue that works that prove unremunerative because there is no demand for the accommodation which they offer—as is the

case with several American roads, and may be with some of the 'block' or 'armour plate' lines constructed by our great companies—represent an useless expenditure, and therefore an injury to the nation; but that works that only fail to yield a return to the immediate owners through their own insufficiency of capital or financial mismanagement, are nevertheless a benefit to the public.

Scarcely less contradictory are the current views respecting the constitution and internal arrangement of railway companies. Thirty years ago Limited Liability Companies were looked upon as common enemies of humanity, against which too many safeguards could hardly be provided. Since that time a great measure of freedom has, by the Joint Stock Companies Act, been given to associations of this description, and railways, so far from being privileged and favoured above others, find themselves at present the most fettered and restricted. All who cherish protectionist tendencies, and many who do not, hold that in this case it is wise and expedient that the Legislature should ascertain that the undertaking is sound and likely to prove lucrative to the shareholders, and should further see that its finance be so regulated as to afford safe investments to the public. Persons of strong free-trade proclivities, on the contrary, consider such paternal regulations not only as obstacles to the multiplication of railways, but as an illegitimate interference with commercial affairs if they are enforced, and as snares and delusions if they are not. They point to the creation of Lloyds' bonds, the excessive issue of debentures, the hundred other evasions of statutory restrictions, and argue that the attempt by legislative enactment to control the ingenuity of speculators or to regulate the financial operations of great companies is an undertaking as hopeless, and little less absurd, than that of Xerxes to bind the Hellespont in chains.*

Parliament faithfully reflects the confusion and vacillation of opinion of those it represents. It affirms no principle and lays down no rule for the guidance of its Committees in regard to competition. The House of Commons directs an inquiry into the financial arrangements and prospects of Companies, but, while some Committees make such an investigation, others turn a deaf ear to the subject. Both the Act of Parliament and the

* An excellent summary of the law in the above respects, and some well-considered suggestions for its amendment, are contained in a paper by Mr. Howard Warburton Elphinstone, entitled 'The 'Borrowing Powers of Railway Companies,' read before the Juridical Society in February 1866.

Standing Orders relating to the deposits to be made as securities for the *bona fides* of a new undertaking, contemplate that the money or stocks deposited shall be the property of the promoters and applicable to the construction of their works; it was, however, stated in evidence before the above-named Committee of the Lords, that of late years in the case of nine-tenths of the new companies, the sum deposited is merely borrowed for the period of the parliamentary campaign and to effect a colourable compliance with the requirements of the Legislature. If in such a case the Bill comes before a Committee that entertains the objection the scheme breaks down, but in the vast majority of instances the Bill runs the gauntlet, and the line is by some means or other eventually constructed. While, however, Committees on the one hand have been growing more lax in their inquiries into the *bona fides* of deposits, the Referees on the other have been appointed to search with more minuteness than ever into the correctness of the estimates for new works, chiefly as a measure of the sufficiency of the amount deposited; possibly in some instances with the view of ascertaining the comparative cost of competing schemes. The investigation formerly instituted by Committees into the probable traffic of a new road has been in great measure abandoned; that into engineering, made with the idea of securing travellers against the risks of accidents from defective construction, also fell into disuse. The establishment of the Referee Courts has recently revived the examination into engineering, though only on such points as are raised by opponents, the Referees themselves taking no initiative in the matter.

Finally, in the House of Lords during the last session an avowed attempt was made to put restrictions upon the enterprise of adventurers, and thus to check that over-speculation in railways to which the embarrassment and the disasters prevailing in the monetary world were in great degree attributed. On the motion of Lord Redesdale the Committee already referred to was appointed to consider the expediency of requiring, as a condition precedent to the introduction of a Bill, the completion of a contract binding those who should sign it to furnish nearly the whole of the capital necessary for the undertaking. Such a subscription-contract, as it was termed, used formerly to be called for, but was seven or eight years ago abandoned, having been found in practice futile and deceptive. It is still, however, it may be observed, attempted to be enforced by Act of Parliament, before any compulsory powers to acquire lands can be exercised by a Company. Besides reverting to subscription-contracts, it was proposed to the Committee to limit the transfer

of shares, and by other restrictions to secure that railways should be made with cash not with credit, and by means of local funds rather than as a contractor's speculation. These recommendations were set aside, but new and more stringent orders as to deposits, in some degree inconsistent with those of the House of Commons, were adopted. The Report of the Committee is, however, mainly of interest and instruction as showing how perplexed and how fluctuating opinions still are upon the most elementary principles of railway economy and railway policy.

Notwithstanding all these difficulties, Parliament, the House of Commons more especially, clings to its jurisdiction in matters of private business; partly from that love of power which is inherent in all assemblies, but partly also from a feeling that it is a legislative task from which the representatives of the people ought not to shrink. Service on private bill Committees is, it is well known, profoundly distasteful to individual members. And no wonder, seeing that there is neither pleasure, fame, or profit to be derived from it, and that it does not even constitute a recommendation in the eyes of constituents. The M.P. who reads a telegram in the 'Times' in the morning, and in the afternoon puts a question in the House asking a Minister whether he also has seen it, displays himself more conspicuously before the world than one who for weeks, perhaps for months, has been engaged in the hearing and consideration of a group of most intricate Bills. We have already shown how the Lower House has from time to time endeavoured, by the vicarious sacrifice of Examiners and of Referees, and by devoting a certain number out of its own body to the Moloch of private business, to relieve itself of some portion of this irksome duty.

The task of those gentlemen who are appointed to serve during an entire Session as Chairmen of Railway Committees is especially onerous and thankless. They are called upon to preside over inquiries which have been by a high authority, Mr. Lowe, compared to suits at *Nisi prius* in which the facts are complicated, the parties numerous, the questions of evidence intricate and embarrassing, and the bar to be controlled acute and energetic. It can be no reflection upon Parliament to say that the number of its members both willing and able to conduct such a trial is limited; more particularly if we bear in mind how many are necessarily excused, or disqualified owing to parliamentary or professional avocations. Moreover all the business is crowded into, and has to be disposed of, in a very few months, and it is in vain to multiply Committees unless competent Chairmen can also be multiplied. It has been observed that the large additions that have, in consequence of the

growth of business, been made to the original number of Sessional Railway Chairmen have already materially detracted from the efficiency and compactness of the Panel.*

In view then of the unsettled state of public opinion on the subject of railways, and of the fluctuating elements of which Committees, especially those of the elective branch of the Legislature, are composed, we need not be surprised that the decision of parliamentary tribunals give rise to some dissatisfaction. We need not be surprised at complaints that a decision depends in the main on what happen to be the politico-economical views of a Chairman, and that the fate of any given Bill is to be forecast, rather by a reference to the doctrine of chances than to any established rule or principle.

What is the remedy for this state of things? We might cut the knot by securing to existing Companies a monopoly of the districts they occupy, or by proclaiming complete free trade in railways; but protection is now-a-days inadmissible, and competition in this instance proves deficient. For a comprehensive regulation of railways by government, still less for their acquisition by the State, the country is not ripe, whatever it may hereafter become. We seem therefore of necessity thrown back upon the rule—so just in theory, so easily laid down, but so difficult of application—that every case must be determined upon its own merits. The only practical consideration then becomes, by what machinery this policy, or rather want of policy, may be most efficiently carried out; in fact, how we can improve the tribunal to which our railway legislation is entrusted.

Among the innumerable schemes proposed with this object two only appear to us worthy of serious consideration. One is for the erection of a Board external to both Houses that shall make provisional orders to be subsequently confirmed or rejected by Parliament; the other is for an absolute and entire transfer of jurisdiction to a permanent judicial tribunal.

The former is recommended on the ground that there has been experience of its working in the matter of inclosures, of piers and harbours, and under the Board of Health and Local Government Acts. The case of railways is, however, widely different from any of these, and the interests involved of greater importance. Inclosures only concern a certain

* Two permanent Chairmen of Turnpike-road Committees were first appointed in 1848. The result having been to expedite business and secure uniformity of decisions, the same plan was adopted for railways, and five such chairmen were appointed in 1853. Since then their number has increased to seventeen or eighteen.

number of owners who decide by a majority among themselves that they wish their rights to be dealt with in a certain manner. The public interests at stake are comparatively small; they amount to no more than the setting out of a road, and possibly the allotment of a recreation ground, within the limits of the inclosure. The Commissioners have merely to see that all things are carried out in accordance with the terms of an Act of Parliament, and in practice inclosures seldom give rise to Parliamentary contests; in some recent instances they have, nevertheless, excited more than usual interest, and been questioned in Parliament in consequence of a prescriptive claim to the enjoyment of open spaces having been advanced on behalf of the public.

Under the Local Government Act very wide powers are conferred under provisional orders made by a Secretary of State, extending even to the compulsory purchase of land. But these orders are only issued on the requisition of a community, the members of which have by themselves, or by their local representatives, expressed themselves in favour of such measures. The unsuccessful working of the preliminary investigations of the Board of Trade under Lord Dalhousie, and of the Preliminary Inquiries Act passed in 1845 but repealed in 1851, afford no encouraging precedents for the application of this system to railways. Even if provisional orders were made by a Court sitting and hearing evidence publicly, it is not probable that either promoters or opponents, where such important interests as those involved in railroad bills were at stake, would often rest satisfied without appealing to the legislature; or that Parliament would as a rule adopt the conclusions of the court without a rehearing of the case. If it did not thus accept the former decisions, we should only be encumbered with an additional inquiry; if it did, we should be in fact reduced to the worse alternative of a permanent tribunal.

To commit to a permanent judicial tribunal independent of Parliament, and from whose decision there should be no appeal, the power of legislating in regard to railways, would in our opinion be even more objectionable than any system of provisional orders. Thirteen great Companies at the present time command three-fourths of the whole traffic of the United Kingdom. As mere associations they possess, from their wealth and employment of labour, an enormous influence in the country. The total receipts of railways in the year 1864 exceeded 35,000,000*l.*, while they had in their immediate service an army of 110,000 men. Some Companies singly

represent a capital of 40,000,000*l.*, while their annual income vies with that of the greatest and most powerful corporation in the world, the established church of Great Britain and Ireland. There is no foreseeing how much this vast wealth and power may be fused and concentrated by alliances or by amalgamations. It is impossible, we think, to entrust the creation of such Titanic powers to any body other than the supreme legislature itself. Even in less important cases power is given to adventurers to take or interfere with private property, to over-ride public rights, to carry works into the heart of great towns, while a partial, if not an entire monopoly of the communications of a district is placed in their hands. The material point at issue before a railway committee is, we must repeat, essentially one of policy. It is not the finding of facts, the construction of a document or the ascertainment of a right and a wrong, but the weighing of, and deciding upon, advantages and disadvantages to the public. A permanent tribunal must be bound by rules, it will make consistency its chief aim, will fall into a groove and decide according to its own precedents; but the circumstances of railways, the views, the wishes, and the wants of the people, have so varied in the last twenty or thirty years and still so vary, that no stereotyped code could have fitted itself to the opinions and requirements of the country. Moreover, by the all but unanimous testimony of the unofficial witnesses examined on this subject in 1863 and on other occasions, Parliamentary Committees, from their prestige and independence, carry with them a moral weight such as would not attend any other tribunal. If these views be correct, we are driven to the conclusion that, with all its faults, a committee of the representatives of the people, bound to watch and study the times and immediately responsible to public opinion, is the most fit tribunal, and that the improvement, not the abolition of such committees, is the object reformers should aim at.

The weakness of committees lies in their want of experience of the rules and practice of law, of acquaintance with precedents, and of knowledge of the principles and ideas by which committees sitting in adjoining rooms are guided. They are in the position of a jury with a difficult case, and no judge to preside over them. The institution of a General Committee of Chairmen, excellent as it is, has failed, owing to circumstances we have already adverted to, adequately to meet these deficiencies. The establishment of permanent paid chairmen would, looking only to the efficiency of the tribunal, afford the best solution of the difficulty. The House would thereby not

only secure the services of those members actually in the receipt of salaries, but induce a further number to devote themselves to this class of business in the hope of succeeding to the emolument and recognised position of such a chairmanship. The constitutional objections, however, are so strongly felt, and the sense of the House itself is so adverse to this scheme, that it is needless to discuss it. The permanent element must therefore be supplied from without. We would incorporate with every committee on a difficult group of bills an Assessor, not a member of the House, possessing technical knowledge and experience of parliamentary practice. We would have such arrangements made as would enable these 'continuous 'service men' to sit as Referees upon questions of engineering and of estimate (if it be thought proper to persevere in separating these branches from the main inquiry), before the meeting of Parliament in each year, and distribute them in the manner suggested among different Committees during the session.

The work of Parliament would be greatly facilitated and valuable time gained for its transaction, by the adoption of another reform—namely, that Private Bills should be introduced in one session, but not finally disposed of till the following year. Bills, whether commenced in the Lords or the Commons, should be read a first and a second time, and distributed into groups in their first session. Petitions against Bills must also be deposited, and the claims of petitioners to be heard, decided at this time. The Assessors, who should for this purpose at least be the officers of both Houses, should in the course of the recess hear, and prepare reports upon, the questions specially remitted to them. Committees would thus be enabled to commence their labours immediately upon the meeting of Parliament, whereas under the present system a month or more necessarily elapses before they can enter upon their duties.

We hasten to assure our readers that we have proposed no revolutionary innovation for which precedents cannot be produced. In 1845, in consequence of the great pressure of business, Bills were in both Houses advanced through certain stages only, and proceeded with in the following session. In the case of dissolutions the progress of Private Bills has repeatedly been deferred, not merely from one session to another, but from one Parliament to its successor. Instances occurred in 1831, 1842, 1847, 1857, and 1859. The orders made for the purpose in the year last named may be seen by referring to the Journals of the House of Commons. They are singularly plain, and their execution was not found in practice to be attended with difficulty.

A suspension of Bills from one session to another of the same Parliament would obviously be a still simpler arrangement.*

The legislation of foreign countries on the subject of Railways, and the fruits it has produced, are often contrasted with our own to the disadvantage of the latter. On the continent of Europe, as in other matters so in that of railways, less is left to private enterprise and private management, and less regard is paid to private rights. Thus, as a rule, the construction of a line does not admit of being disputed as among ourselves. The Government, *proprio motu*, or in consequence of an application for a concession, decree, that on public grounds, a particular road, passing through certain points, should be made. The precise direction to be followed and the engineering are subsequently determined. Local objections and private claims are heard and decided by tribunals on the spot, and compensation for expropriation or injury is awarded by juries. Where the construction or partial construction of a line is entrusted to a company, a deposit of caution-money is usually required by the State as security for the execution of the work. This deposit is no idle form, as such pledges have proved in England, but a forfeiture is strictly enforced on failure of performance by the undertakers.

In comparing this simpler legislation with our own it should not be forgotten that England was the discoverer and pioneer of an unknown system. Great and unforeseen difficulties,—monopoly, territorial feuds, offensive and defensive alliances between companies, local prejudice, the fears, the ignorance, the cupidity of private owners, sprang up on every side to perplex and thwart those entrusted with the conduct of affairs.

---

* We ought perhaps to notice, lest we should be supposed to have overlooked them, certain recent Acts in connexion with railways. One, the Railway Construction Facilities Act, 1864, among other provisions, empowers the Board of Trade to grant a certificate for making a railway, which, if not questioned by Parliament within a specified time, becomes valid. Inasmuch, however, as the issue of the certificate is conditional upon the consent of all parties concerned, and, above all, upon the absence of objection by 'any railway 'or canal company in any way affected,' the Act has thus far proved a dead letter. Another Act authorising Committees on Bills to award costs against vexatious opponents or promoters has also, we believe, remained inoperative. A third Act is intended to restrain railway companies from exceeding their parliamentary powers in the issue of debentures. This statute was only passed last session, and it is therefore at present impossible to say how far it may succeed in its object

Other nations had the opportunity afforded of profiting by English experience and learning how to avoid or defeat similar evils. Belgium waited for five years after the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester line before she adopted railways; then her minister, M. Rogier, pursued a plan the very reverse of that of Great Britain, took the railway, like the postal service, altogether into the hands of the State, and aimed at earning no more than should be sufficient to cover their expenses. Germany followed still more cautiously. In most of the southern and in some of the northern States lines have, as a rule, been made wholly or partially by the Government, and thereupon leased to companies for a term of years. In Prussia and in the North generally the practice has been to concede both the construction and the working of lines to companies, subject to Government supervision, revision of tolls, and a limitation of profits commonly fixed at 10 per cent. France hesitated and deliberated longer than the other leading countries of Europe. She first rejected a scheme for the construction of railways by the State, and then shrank from trusting them to private enterprise. At length a mixed system was adopted, under which lines were constructed partly at the cost of the Government, partly at that of the localities to be benefited by them, and partly at that of companies to which they were conceded for terms of from forty to fifty-five years. By such support the Monarchy stimulated the creation of railways; but owing to the timidity of French capitalists and other circumstances, the Republican Government found itself compelled in great measure to take into its own hands the construction of the lines in progress. The development of French railways being still tardy, the Empire sought to accomplish it by fostering and favouring a few great companies. By a policy of amalgamation and centralisation it soon reduced 59 existing companies to the number of 27, of whom 6 possessed an overwhelming power and interest. In return for the extension of the terms of their concessions to ninety-nine years, and other inducements, the favoured companies undertook to carry out a network of secondary lines. Finding, however, that these were not likely to prove as remunerative as they had anticipated, but on the contrary threatened to depreciate the profits of their entire systems, they turned upon the Government and declared themselves unable to fulfil their engagements. The Government might have taken back the lines conceded, and either completed them itself, or granted them anew to independent companies. It dared not, however, thus enter into a contest with the mighty powers it had raised up, and on each occasion it capitulated. The result has been

that the concessions to each company have been divided into two categories, the old and the new *reseau;* the old *reseau* embracing the trunk lines, has a separate account, and depends upon its own resources. The new *reseau*, consisting principally of subsidiary lines in great part unfinished, received a guarantee from the Government of a minimum interest of 4·65 per cent. upon the estimated cost of construction. No doubt it is also stipulated that if the profits of the primary lines should exceed a certain amount such excess shall be applied towards making good the deficit on the auxiliary lines, and the Government was thus led to believe, or found it politic to affect to believe, that it would not in the long run be called upon to make good its guarantee to any serious extent. It is, however, but too probable that it has undertaken an obligation which, inasmuch as the mileage receipts continue to diminish as the branch lines are extended, will prove durable, and may amount to 4,000,000*l.* or 5,000,000*l.* a year.*

When, therefore, we are told that in Belgium, Germany, and France legislation is simpler and cheaper, the cost of railways less, their fares lower and their profits greater, than in England, it should be remembered that those nations pay in taxation for the saving to travellers and the gain to shareholders. Nor need we in other respects shrink from comparison. Private interest at home succeeds as well as Government initiative abroad, in selecting the lines best suited to the wants of the country. Subsidiary lines which on the Continent are not made at all, or made only by means of heavy responsibilities undertaken by the State, are here supplied either by the enterprise of capitalists, or by the main lines themselves, spurred by the fear of competition. France, for instance, with an area almost double that of the United Kingdom, has little more than half the number of miles of railroad. One circuitous and inconvenient route between Paris and Calais retains a monopoly of the communications between the capital and that important seaport. Applications have been made to supply the want of railways in the immediate neighbourhood of Paris, but from æsthetic or political reasons the Government refuses the requisite authority to construct them. On the lines that are open to the public the regulations are more stringent, the speed is less, and the accommodation more limited than in England.

---

* It should be added that Government may, under certain remote circumstances, receive a share of the profits of the old *reseau*, and also be remembered that at the expiration of the terms of concession it will find itself the possessor of a vast number of miles of railway.

French trains travel at rates not exceeding from 20 to 34 miles an hour; on the Continent generally the average is not more than 20 miles. A reference to the French and English Bradshaws shows that while there are 16 trains in the 24 hours between London and Manchester and Liverpool, there are only 6 from Paris to Lyons and Marseilles.

The private bill legislation of the United States, though not equal in bulk to our own, is yet very voluminous. The numerous Acts termed Private which are annually passed by Congress relate mainly to accounts, claims, compensations, indemnities, and grants of public lands to individuals for services rendered to the government. The great mass of private legislation, according to our definition of the term, is carried on by the Parliaments of the different States. The grant of Charters, which answer to our local and personal Acts, for the construction of railways and other public works, is, with the exceptions hereinafter adverted to, exclusively within the competence of the State legislatures. In Massachusetts, for instance, the scheme for a railroad is examined and reported upon by a committee of members, and if the charter be conceded, the terms of the purchase of land, where compulsion must be resorted to, are settled by local bodies, the County Commissioners. In some cases the States have reserved to themselves a considerable control over the undertaking; in some they become themselves the principal shareholders, in others they advance money or guarantee a certain amount of capital; in some instances a power to revise fares is conferred upon the legislature, in others a maximum dividend of 10 per cent. has been fixed as a limit on reaching which the corporation, as the company is commonly styled, shall be bound to reduce its charges. On the other hand, some corporations, especially among those created in early times, have obtained in their charter a stipulation that the legislature would grant no charter to any competing line for a fixed term of years, and such stipulations are held to be binding contracts between the State and the corporation.

Notwithstanding the diversity of circumstances between America and England, the results of a railway system initiated by private enterprise have proved, in the older and more settled States at least, on the whole very similar to those arrived at in this country. America imported her first locomotive engine from England in the year 1829, but, unlike the States of the European continent, she did not wait for English experience but at once struck out her own course. In the following year an engine of American manufacture was at work upon a rail-

way in the Southern States designed to connect Charleston with Savannah. As in Europe, however, so in America, coal gave the great impetus to the construction of metal roads. The great mining State Pennsylvania took the lead, and in the session of 1830 granted no less than twelve charters to as many corporations, while before three years had elapsed sixty-seven lines were opened within its borders. Virginia, and next Massachusetts and other Northern States, followed the example of Pennsylvania. Each State hastened to grant charters for its own purposes, but often refused to authorise a road lest it should benefit a neighbour, or give some special advantage to a portion of its own territory. Competition and self-defence, on the part both of states and of corporations, also played a great part in the creation of Transatlantic railways. Boston first pushed a line westward to secure the traffic of the inland States, and New York felt compelled to send out a similar line without delay. Pennsylvania was thus driven to carry her rails first over, and latterly through the Alleghanies, to Pittsburgh and the regions beyond. Thereupon Baltimore, Charleston, Savannah, in turn pressed on to reach the Mississippi, and their lines again obliged the Gulf cities, Mobile and New Orleans, to construct lines running north and south lest the rival towns on the Atlantic seaboard should rob them of the trade of the great valley.

American lines have thus, like the English, been laid out and constructed without reference to any definite or comprehensive system. In many instances they have been made with the deliberate intention of thwarting, rather than of facilitating, continuous communication. One among numerous evils that have ensued, has been the introduction of a great diversity of gauges, varying from 4 feet 10 inches in Ohio and New Jersey to 6 feet on the New York and Erie line. Owing mainly to the cheapness of land and the great extent of level country, the capital expenses of American roads have been less, but in consequence of their inferior construction, their working expenses are greater, than those of English railways. Their embankments are usually narrow, their drainage neglected, the sleepers of unseasoned wood, and the iron of very indifferent quality; their fares are indeed less than our own, but so also are their comfort, their speed, and their safety.

While the legislation of the several States has been on the whole analogous to that of Parliament at home, the position of Congress in regard to railways has been very different. Except within the district of Columbia, its functions have been confined to authorising corporations sanctioned by other legislatures to carry their lines through public lands or United States pro-

perty; to remitting the duties on iron in favour of particular corporations, and to making grants of public lands in the less settled States and in the Territories with the view of encouraging and accelerating the establishment of railways. Measures for the above purposes are classed as public, not as private Acts. In the year 1855, however, Congress passed two general laws upon this subject. The first gives a right of way through any land belonging to the United States, to any rail-road, plank-road, or turnpike-road, duly chartered by the legislature of the State within which such land is situate; the second, and perhaps more important Act, grants the same privilege in the Territories. By these Acts Congress may be said, so far as its authority extends, to have recognised the principle of unrestricted competition in railways.

On the whole we doubt whether, with a view to improving legislation at home, there is much to be learnt by looking abroad. The paternal system of continental governments is unsuited to English habits and ideas. That of the older and settled States of the American Union, which most resembles our own, has involved them in similar difficulties and drawbacks. The circumstances of the Western States and Territories are too entirely different from those of a densely peopled country of limited extent, to afford any precedent or offer any analogy. We are therefore driven to seek counsel of our own experience and to shape our own course of action.

Science and mechanical skill have in the last half-century worked wonders in facilitating trade and intercourse with foreign countries, but how much of their advantages would have been lost had we not at the same time shaken off legislative trammels and thrown down fiscal barriers. Let us take heed lest we allow artificial obstacles to thwart the operation of the same beneficent powers at home. The time has now come, or is close at hand, when railways may become the ordinary means of communication throughout the kingdom; when the locomotive, having superseded the mail coach and the stage waggon, may enter into competition with the omnibus and the carrier. Trains are no longer unwieldy saurians that can only drag their length along the level, for which the spade and the pick must fill up the valley and

> 'Pare the mountain to the plain to leave an equal baseness.'

Lines can now adapt themselves to the natural features of a country, they can follow the sinuosities of the watercourse and the ravine, scale the hill-top and wind down the mountain-side. *Opposuit natura Alpesque nivesque*—yet locomotive engines, ascending and descending by gradients of 1 in 12, rolling

round curves with a radius of 120 feet, have proved themselves able to convey trains weighing from 20 to 40 tons over Mont Cenis and the Semmering at the rate of twelve miles an hour and upwards. Slight and cheap railways fitted to the character of the district they serve have already been constructed in Scotland. Even in France the local authorities have begun to apply to roads the powers given them by law to make highways. The Council of the Bas-Rhin, with the aid of the communes concerned, within the last two years has planned and opened some subsidiary lines, and other departments are said to be preparing to follow the example thus set in Alsatia.

That minor railways admit of being introduced in every part of the British Isles will scarcely be called in question. It is, indeed, estimated by competent engineers that a class of lines having a gauge of 3 or 3½ feet, gradients of 1 in 40, and curves of 300 feet radius, may be constructed at a cost of from 3,000*l.* to 5,000*l.* a mile, the average cost of the existing English lines having been 39,000*l.* a mile. If such or any other railroads are, however, to become cheap and abundant, Parliament and the public must make up their minds to adopt simple principles, readily understood and easy of application. On this head very valuable evidence was given by Mr. Booth, the late Secretary to the Board of Trade, before the Committee of 1863. The period having moreover arrived when the provisions of the Act of 1844, giving the Government power on certain conditions to deal with railway companies, become operative, renders a reconsideration of our policy of practical importance at the present time.

The self-interest and acuteness of private enterprise is surely as much to be relied upon in railway as in other undertakings. If this be so, it would not be unreasonable to act upon the presumption, that where persons are found desirous of establishing a line, it is one which they can either themselves work at a profit, or induce others to rent or to purchase — the best possible evidence that it is one of some utility, and that meets some demand. This principle being once admitted, the objections of owners of property, and of local bodies, might fairly be confined to their own special grievances, and not be allowed to militate against an entire scheme. Nor for the same reason, should competition be recognised as giving any right to a rival line to constitute itself an *avvocato del diavolo* in opposition to a work which as a whole is of public benefit. Established companies must in this case rest content with the advantage, of which none can deprive them, of having been first in the field, and of having selected, or had the opportunity of selecting, the best possible line. They would moreover themselves be

gainers by the introduction of fixed principles in legislation, and enjoy greater facilities for the extension of their own systems. The same reliance on self-interest might further lead to the abandonment of the attempts to impose checks and limits upon the financial operations of railways, beyond those of other joint-stock companies; contractors and shareholders, borrowers and lenders, and all other parties concerned, would thus be left to the exercise of their own diligence and discretion. At all events, the legislature, without unnecessarily trammelling the free action of companies, would content itself with adopting safeguards against frauds upon the public. Again, subject to general provisions for the protection and safety of the public, the construction of works would be left in the hands of the promoters, in the confidence that their own judgment and advantage would secure their execution in the manner best calculated to meet the requirements of the district. On the other hand, provision should be made for expeditiously winding up the affairs of railway companies. The forfeiture of deposits, or exaction of penalties, in the event of failure, within a prescribed period, to carry out the powers conceded, should no longer remain a dead letter, but be unflinchingly enforced, and herein would be found the simplest and most efficient security against mere bubble schemes. The enactments regulating the conditions upon which companies may acquire private property, framed many years ago, and adapted to the case of rural estates, require to be amended and rendered more applicable to the compulsory purchase of, or interference with, streets and buildings in great centres of population. In return also for the greater measure of freedom granted to railways, Parliament might well reserve to some public department ampler powers of supervision, and to itself a fuller authority periodically to revise the conditions of, or in certain cases to terminate concessions.

By the adoption of principles such as those indicated the functions of the legislature would be brought within the compass of its powers efficiently to perform them. Directors would cease to expend the resources of their shareholders in internecine parliamentary struggles. The incautious or the ignorant would no longer be tempted to invest in railways in the blind confidence, too often vainly indulged, that Parliament has provided them with an indefeasible security, and relieved them from the necessity for vigilance in the conduct of their own affairs. Lastly, if no more important results, such as the multiplication and cheapening of the means of communication followed, the legislature would at least be freed from the possible imputation of presenting artificial obstacles to their development.

ART. IV.—*The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Vols. I.–III. London: 1862–5.

THE publication of an elaborate work on the great kingdoms which sprang up and flourished to the east of the river Euphrates, is perhaps a sign that the harvest of Mesopotamian and Persian explorations has been in substance gathered in. Conscious as he is that 'the history of Antiquity requires 'from time to time to be re-written,' Mr. Rawlinson would scarcely have taken the trouble to arrange a history stretching back far into the second millennium before the Christian era, if there had been any ground for thinking that future discoveries in the Assyrian plains would render it necessary not long hence to do the work over again. By coming forward as the historian of these distant ages, he expresses his belief that the materials are sufficient both in quality and quantity to warrant a reconstruction of the annals of Babylon, Nineveh, and Susa. On this task he has expended great toil and much learning; and his work attests diligence, if not ingenuity, in cementing the fragments collected in his multifarious researches.

The knowledge thus amassed has been obtained partly by an examination of the countries themselves, and partly by a comparison of cuneiform inscriptions with the historical notices left to us by Greek and other writers. On the results obtained by the latter method we shall have to pronounce a judgment with which Mr. Rawlinson is not likely to be gratified; and we therefore at once express our thanks to him for presenting in moderate compass and in an intelligible shape the archæological information gleaned from Assyrian mounds by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Layard, M. Botta, and other well-known explorers. The conclusions based on the evidence of language are more important; and without committing ourselves here to an acceptance of the methods or conclusions of Egyptologists and the decipherers of cuneiform inscriptions, we have no reluctance for the present to accept their results as established.* In the case of the Mesopotamian nations the

* We grant this, simply to give Mr. Rawlinson all possible advantage. In point of fact, almost every inscription is more or less a subject of dispute; and Mr. Rawlinson is premature, if not rash, in asserting that 'the best linguists in Europe have accepted the 'decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions as a thing actually 'accomplished.' This is not the case. Professor Max Müller, to

wealth of illustration supplied by their religious and civil monuments renders this evidence almost superfluous. An examination of Aryan languages teaches us that the ideas of religion, justice, and law, the practice of agriculture, with fixed habitations, the recognition of property, marriage, and kindred, long preceded the dawn even of traditional history among the ancestors of the Hindu and Greek, the Teuton and the Persian. But such comparisons must proceed on a fixed method, and follow the laws of grammatical analysis. We are willing to accept, on the evidence of language, the fact that the Chaldæan monarchy was established by a Cushite or Ethiopian people; but the fact must first be proved, as we prove that the Greek πατήρ and εἰμί are identical with the English *father* and *am*. But Mr. Rawlinson will have it that the old Chaldæan language exhibits affinities with Aryan, Turanian, and Semitic dialects all at once;* and in support of this assertion he gives a list of thirty or forty Cushite words, in which he traces a resemblance to words of the same meaning in Greek, Turkish, Arabic, Latin, and English.

Mr. Rawlinson is one of the large number of laborious and omnivorous students who can read a book and express their approbation of a scientific method laid down in it, without perceiving that they are bound to follow that method. He has not only read Professor Max Müller's Lectures on Language, but even expresses his belief that it would be as difficult to impose on him a fabricated language 'as to palm off a fictitious 'for a real animal form on Professor Owen.'† Yet unless he means that the primitive Chaldæan dialect directly borrowed certain words from Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic, and German, this

---

whom Mr. Rawlinson specially refers, has not, so far as we are aware, expressed his belief in the interpretation of cuneiform documents. All that he has said amounts apparently to this, that the Persian inscriptions have undoubtedly been deciphered, and that the cuneiform inscriptions are written in a Semitic language, in which some words have been read. But there is a vast difference between these scanty gleanings and a coherent grammatical analysis of continuous documents. We should also be glad to know more distinctly whether Sir Henry Rawlinson does or does not give the sanction of his great authority and experience to the interpretations which his brother so confidently puts forward. If he is prepared to give them this sanction, why does he keep silence? If he thinks them doubtful or unwarranted, is it fair to allow them to usurp, under the shadow of his name, a degree of credit to which they are perhaps not entitled?

* Vol. i. p. 78. † Introduction, p. vi.

Cushite language must have been a genus in itself. It is one of the first principles of comparative philology that 'sound 'etymology can have nothing to do with sound.' Professor Max Müller's lectures may be regarded as a long sermon on this single text. To use his words, 'If there is any truth in 'the laws which govern the growth of language, we can lay it 'down with perfect certainty that words of identically the 'same sound in English and in Sanskrit cannot be the same 'words.' Professor Max Müller is speaking of languages which are closely and intimately allied: Professor Rawlinson, speaking of languages which do not belong to the same branch, the same class, or even the same family, catches at mere sound, and talks of affinities between dialects as remote as those of Somersetshire and the Maori. It is almost incredible that any one, who professes to have acquainted himself with the first principles of philology, can suggest comparisons between the Chaldæan *ki* and the Greek γῆ, the earth; between *san* and *sun;* between *gar* and the Sanskrit *kri*, to make, or *kurra* and the Hindustani *gorra*, a horse. There is much stronger evidence to prove the affinity of Tahitian with Greek, of Hawaiian with Sanskrit, of Kafir and English.* The method adopted by Mr. Rawlinson, always false, is now puerile; nor can he well shelter himself under the plea that his list was drawn up before Professor Max Müller's second series of Lectures on Language appeared. More than one critic of his ponderous edition of Herodotus pointed out the absurdity of connecting the Hamite *dav* or *dam* with the French *dame*, or the Phrygian *lada* with the English *lady*. Not a whit abashed, Mr. Rawlinson repeats the absurdity, adding others which we shall not make more ridiculous, if we compare the Chaldæan *gala* not only, as he compares it, with the Gallic *guda*, but with the Greek μεγάλα. Childish as all this may seem, it is important to note that the great reconstructor of Assyrian annals is one who draws momentous historical conclusions from the affinity of the Cushite *nir* with the Greek ἀνήρ, and of *ar*, a river, with ῥέειν and the Slavonic *rika*.†

That the Assyrian explorations have thrown considerable light on subjects in which geographers, antiquarians, and ethnologists must feel a deep interest, there can be no question: that the inscriptions found in ruined Mesopotamian cities afford some real additions to our historical knowledge, we have no

* Max Müller, 'Lectures on Language,' vol. vi. p. 283. Second series.

† Vol. iii. p. 161.

wish to dispute. It is unfortunate, however, that Mr. Rawlinson has allowed neither the antiquities nor the inscriptions to speak for themselves. In plain words, his method is singularly unhappy. To a work which should exhibit clearly and accurately the precise results of Assyrian excavation, and enable the reader to form his own judgment on the contents and character of the inscriptions, no exception could be taken: but a work which mixes up these results with illustrations from ancient writers belonging to other countries, which gives just so much of the information contained in the inscriptions as may suit the writer's purpose, which ekes out the scanty details furnished by inscribed bricks with obscure hints or even inferences from the hints of later and foreign historians, can serve only to irritate, bewilder, or deceive.

As we approach the inscriptions, the case becomes more serious. These ancient monuments furnish, we are told, an authentic history of the country for a period preceding the conquests of Alexander by nearly two thousand years. On the evidence afforded by them, Mr. Rawlinson undertakes to reconcile the hopelessly conflicting statements of Herodotus and Berosus, of Manetho and Syncellus, of Eusebius and Josephus. So clearly do they speak of those dim and distant ages, that Mr. Rawlinson passes fearlessly over the many formidable chasms which separate successive dynasties, or sunder one part of a dynasty from another. In the absence of all evidence except that which is derived from these monuments, we have a right to know what these inscriptions really affirm. The information demanded lies within a very narrow compass; but this information, for some inexplicable reason, Mr. Rawlinson has withheld. When the inscriptions or the names of twenty kings lie scattered like the broken shafts of a clustered pier, we wish to know what grounds we have for distributing them in one order rather than in another. For such an assurance, in many instances, we search Mr. Rawlinson's pages in vain; in others, we are put off with possibilities and probabilities, which are crowded together in such wild luxuriance as to suggest the idea of a history cast in the potential mood.

Except as a record of actual facts, all history is worse than worthless. If isolated events are to be received apart from their dates, and if dates may be treated by methods of computation which have no reference to the actors in the history, the whole thing becomes a Chinese puzzle, and may be twisted into all sorts of combinations which may certainly have taken place, but of which it is childish to speak as having actually

occurred. The historian who on this ground refuses to admit that Ismidagon lived at a given time merely because Sennacherib mentions a certain Tiglathpileser as having lived four centuries before, and because this Tiglathpileser is said to speak of Ismidagon as having built a temple nearly seven centuries earlier still, does not therefore call into question either the decipherment of cuneiform characters, or the genuineness of the inscription, or the veracity of Sennacherib. We may at once concede that, apart from special reasons for suppressing it (and these might not be wanting), Sennacherib and the other kings who have left records on inscribed bricks would speak the truth respecting the occurrences of their own time; but their testimony is of no value for a period stretching beyond the limit of trustworthy tradition, unless we have evidence that they had a series of contemporary records extending back to that period in unbroken succession. We have no warrant for asserting that such records ever existed; and if they did, their succession is confessedly broken. To infer the reign of a particular king, or to assign him by conjecture to a particular age, to assume a change of dynasty, a revolution, or a conquest on the ground of likelihood, is to cheat ourselves with a semblance of knowledge without the reality. To the true historian the tabulation of chronology is a mischievous mockery; and no time can be more thoroughly misapplied than that which is spent in fixing the periods of a series of reigns on a computation of generations. On this point, it would seem, these much-vaunted inscriptions afford for the earlier Mesopotamian kings no information whatever; the history is therefore arranged by allowing the kings twenty years apiece. An arrangement of English history from the time of the Danish Cnut to that of William the Norman would by this method yield some curious results; and a system which in the history of our own country might lead us to separate by an interval of twenty or forty years the battles of Hastings and Stamford Bridge cannot acquire a greater value when applied to the annals of Nineveh, Babylon, or Susa, three or four thousand years ago. But when Mr. Rawlinson, following the example of the Egyptologists, takes credit for a manipulation of history which leaves an event oscillating in a vacant space of only twenty, thirty, or fifty years,* it is time to remind him of the words of the great statesman whose historical labours he discreetly and systematically ignores.

'It seems to be often believed, and at all events it is perpetually

* Vol. ii. p. 289.

assumed in practice, that historical evidence is different in its nature from other sorts of evidence. Until this error is effectually extirpated, all historical researches must lead to uncertain results. Historical evidence, like judicial evidence, is founded on the testimony of credible witnesses. . . . Unless, therefore, a historical account can be traced by probable proof to the testimony of contemporaries, the first condition of historical credibility fails.'*

Without such evidence we may, if we please, set forth, as an established fact, the existence of an empire older even than that of Nineveh, with a series of kings as real as the kings of England from the days of Alfred; but we shall only be adding to the number of the idols and strengthening the idol worship against which Bacon preached a merciless crusade. Of all counterfeits the most worthless and, in those who parade it, the most contemptible, is the pretended knowledge of men who never lived and of events which never took place. The dreams of the astrologer and the alchemist may be exploded by the scientific demonstration of present facts; but the warnings of historical critics are thrown away upon a writer who is ready to catch at anything which may support his own conclusions, even though he is obliged to resort for it to writers whose authority he has depreciated or whose honesty he has called into question.

In thus speaking, we have no wish to impute to Mr. Rawlinson any intentional unfairness or wilful misrepresentation. Of unconscious injustice and distortion there is indeed more than enough; but all his transgressions of this kind may be traced to his ignorance or disregard of the nature of evidence. Talking much of 'the interests of historic truth,' he has seemingly never cared to determine the limits which separate fact from fiction. With him history is not the less history, even if it be made up in greater or less degree by 'ingenuity and 'conjecture.' Led astray by this misconception of the nature of historical testimony, Mr. Rawlinson naturally confounds verisimilitude with fact, and sets forth, as certain, dates and incidents of which, in other parts of his work, he has spoken with hesitation and doubt. For the same reason the conjectures or inferences of one chapter become the grounds for unqualified assertion in another, and the historical character of the king whose bricks he is reading is the guarantee for the historical character of every prince whose name he recites in his genealogy. In short, he is satisfied with testimony of the kind

* Sir G. C. Lewis, 'Credibility of Early Roman History,' vol. i. p. 16.

which made the judicial processes of the middle ages a by-word and reproach, and consigned to the stake as wizards and sorcerers thousands against whom no modern grand jury would dream of finding a bill. The merits of Mr. Rawlinson as a geographer may be great; in all the qualities indispensable for a trustworthy and accurate narrator of facts he seems to us hopelessly deficient.

We have now to substantiate these charges; and we shall best do so by a thorough examination of the histories which he distinguishes as the Chaldæan and Assyrian. If the process should sometimes be tedious, we may plead in extenuation that even in their newest shape and in the full lustre thrown on them by recent discoveries, the records of Mesopotamian kings exhibit, in Mr. Rawlinson's words, 'the dullest form in which 'history ever presents itself.' It is hard even for the Camden Professor to work himself into enthusiasm, except when he has to describe the magnificence of Babylonish palaces and the fervent piety of Assyrian despots. But wearisome though the contrast may be between the baseless probabilities of Mr. Rawlinson and the well-grounded conclusions of Mr. Grote, the feeling of monotony may be lightened by the consciousness that the discharge of our duty is a bare act of justice to a writer who may reasonably demand that his work shall not be condemned without fair and full examination.

Speaking of the Assyrian monarchy of Nineveh, Mr. Grote says: 'Respecting this empire—its commencement, its extent, 'or even the mode in which it was put down—nothing certain 'can be affirmed.'* Mr. Rawlinson has not only drawn out the history of the dynasties which belonged to this empire, but he is enabled to assert with confidence that it was preceded by an earlier empire, set up by a people called Chaldæans, in the twenty-third century before the Christian era. The dynasty of the founder Nimrod consisted of eleven kings, and was followed by a series of forty-nine Chaldæan monarchs, whose rule was brought to an end by Arabian invaders, who introduced a dynasty of nine kings. This succession of sixty-nine monarchs occupied the time between B.C. 2234 and B.C. 1273. The history of the Chaldæan kingdom is then merged in that of the Assyrian empire until, after the lapse of more than seven centuries, the ancient monarchy was restored at Babylon in the person of Nabonassar. On the strength of the evidence brought together by Mr. Rawlinson, we are called upon to believe that Urukh, the seventh king of Nimrod's dynasty,

* History of Greece, pt. ii. ch. xix.

reigned from about B.C. 2093 to B.C. 2070; that he built the great temple on the Bowariyeh mound at Warka, and raised other important buildings at Ur, Calneh, and Larancha; that astronomical studies, introduced long before, were diligently prosecuted during his reign; and that he was succeeded by his son, who completed some of the temples left unfinished by his father. Not long after these kings, a change of dynasty, it is stated, took place, and an Elamitic family rose to power in the person of Chedorlagamer who was followed by Sinti-shil-khak, the father of Kudur-mabuk. This monarch 'maintained the 'religion of the Chaldæans unchanged, adding to the old 'temples and worshipping the gods under the same titles.' His son, Arid-Sin, is followed, after a blank of forty years, by Ismidagon, 'who was king as early as B.C. 1850, or perhaps 'a little earlier,' and of whose sons Shamas-Vul, the elder, built a temple at Khileh-Shergat, thus showing that 'the 'Chaldæans at this time bore sway in the upper region,' over which Shamas-Iva, the second son, ruled as viceroy. Ismidagon was succeeded, we are told, by his son Ibil-anu-duma, whose son Gunguna, after another blank, was followed by Naramsin, the builder of a temple at Sippara, about B.C. 1750. Fifty years later came Sin-shada, who was followed by 'several 'monarchs of the *Sin* series, after whom may be placed two 'monarchs, a father and a son, by name Purna-puriyas and 'Durri-galazu,' a fact 'established beyond controversy.' The reign of Durri-galazu came to an end in B.C. 1575; and from the darkness which then falls on the history emerge the names of two kings only, Khammurabi and Shamsu-iluna, who 'may 'be placed in the interval between B.C. 1575 and B.C. 1518.' In due time came the great invasion in which 'the native 'Hamitic race was attacked by a foreign Semitic stock, and 'overpowered so as to be forced to accept a change of rulers.'

Thus much Mr. Rawlinson sets forth as the known history of the first great monarchy of the ancient Eastern world. The value of these alleged facts may be measured by the results which we may imagine as being attained by a reconstructor of English history some four or five thousand years hence. After diligently comparing the few scanty fragments which may then survive of the writings of Jeffry of Monmouth, Bede, William of Malmesbury, the Saxon Chronicle, Hume and Macaulay, and after careful excavations in the ruins of London, Manchester, Oxford, and other cities, he may announce with legitimate assurance that the kings who reigned from Brute the Trojan down to William III. were 360, that of Brute's immediate successors the names have been lost,

but that the name of Æthelbert appears about fifteen centuries later as having set up a new faith, that this king was succeeded by his son Eadbald or Eadwin (it is not known which, but Eadwin may have been his viceroy in Northumbria); that some time after these kings a Danish family rose to power in the person of Cnut who was followed by his sons Harold and Harthacnut (in what order is not known, but there are grounds for thinking that Harthacnut came first); that after a blank filled up with the names of eight kings came Edward who built a great church at Westminster, and after him another Harold, and then a king named Stephen, followed after an interval by several monarchs of the *Ed* and *Hen* series, these being followed by two kings, James and Charles, the fact that these were father and son belonging to a family named Stuart being 'established beyond controversy;' but the empire was now on the decline, and the Stuart dynasty was overthrown by an invasion of Dutchmen.

Now we of the present time know that of this reconstructed English history, some of the facts are true, some are stated falsely or put in a wrong sequence, and some are wholly imaginary. For all practical purposes, as giving any knowledge whatever either of English rulers or of the people whom they governed, it would be worse than useless; and its adoption by the future professor of ancient British history in the University of Sahara would tend merely to perpetuate and multiply falsehood.

But thus far we have seen only the bright side of Mr. Rawlinson's reconstruction. When we come to examine the grounds of his assurance, we find (as indeed we knew before) that all his authorities (excepting possibly the monuments) are utterly conflicting; that of the greater number even of the monumental kings he knows next to nothing; that of many he cannot venture to determine so much as the name; that his scheme of Chaldæan chronology is independent of his Chaldæan history; that the former is based on arithmetical computations applied to the lists of one authority arbitrarily chosen out of many who are rejected; that there is no settled and continuous order whether of dynasties or of kings, and that the blanks leave room for the exercise of 'ingenuity and conjecture,' qualities for which the Camden Professor may fairly dispute the palm with Baron Bunsen. In the paramount interest of historical truth, we have now to show that throughout his Chaldæan history there is scarcely a single statement which may not be set down to guess-work, unwarranted inference, or sheer assumption.

At the outset, Mr. Rawlinson's assertion that the first Mesopotamian monarchy was set up by Ethiopian invaders from Africa is made on insufficient grounds: his statement that the Chaldæans were a nation and not a priestly caste, is advanced on no grounds whatever. The former statement we are called upon to receive, first, because in the Odyssey* Poseidon is mentioned as going away in a rage to the Ethiopians who dwell afar off, divided into two portions, some where the sun will sink, others where he rises. 'The most satisfactory explanation,' in Mr. Rawlinson's judgment, 'is that which Strabo gives from 'Ephorus, that the Ethiopians were considered as occupying all 'the South coast both of Asia and Africa, and as divided by the 'Arabian gulf (which separated the two continents) into East-'ern and Western, Asiatic and African.' That this may have been an ethnological fact, we can neither deny nor affirm; but that this was the poet's meaning, is simply incredible. Whether the explanations of comparative mythologists be right or wrong, it is certain that the poet cannot mean a people who were neither toward the rising nor the setting of the sun relatively to himself. Further evidence in favour of his position Mr. Rawlinson finds in the legend of Memnon, the son of Eôs (the dawn). Memnon, according to Herodotus (for whom the rapes of Io, Medea and Helen were events in a connected historical sequence), was founder of Susa: he is claimed, according to Diodorus, as one of their monarchs by the Ethiopians on the Nile, and there was a tribe called Memnones at Meroê. 'Memnon thus unites the Eastern with the Western 'Ethiopians; and the less we regard him as a historical per-'sonage, the more must we view him as personifying the ethnic 'identity of the two races.'† Now Memnon is neither more nor less mythical than Danaüs; and, according to Mr. Rawlinson, the less we regard Danaüs as historical, the more must we look upon him as personifying the ethnic identity of Greeks, Latins, Trojans, and Pelasgians; for we have it on the authority of Niebuhr‡ that 'Danai and Daunii are unquestion-'ably the same, and the Daunii are clearly allied to the 'Tyrrhenian race. Danaê is said to have founded the Pelas-'gico-Tyrrhenian Ardea, and on the other hand the father of 'Tyrrhenus (= Turnus) was according to some called Daunus, 'and his mother Danaê. *Daunus* and *Launus* again are the 'same, *d* and *l* in Latin and in the so-called Æolic dialect 'being always exchanged for one another as in *δάκρυον*

* I. 23, 24.

† Vol. i. p. 60.

‡ Lectures on Ancient History, xxii.

'and *lacryma*, *Ducetius* and *Leucetius*. *Launa*, *Lavinia*, and '*Lavinium* are the same as the different names of the Latins, '*Lavici*, *Lakini*, *Latini*, and all these names are identical 'with Danai.' It is but fair to add that Niebuhr expressed an aversion to drawing historical conclusions from the names of nations, which is apparently not shared by Mr. Rawlinson. Such names present indeed a subject of great interest for philological inquiry, and have never yet been systematically examined; but antiquarians who use them as historical monuments will have their recompense by being cheated into the acceptance of a farrago of absurdities.

For the existence of the Chaldæans as a nation and not merely as a priestly order, Mr. Rawlinson apparently thinks that no proof is needed beyond assertions which contradict each other. In his judgment they are Ethiopian invaders from the South: in that of Heeren they are barbarians from the mountains near the Euxine, while Mannert seems to regard them as of Arabian origin. Mr. Grote, admitting that the passages of Strabo give more countenance to the latter opinion than to that of Heeren, adds that we can 'make out nothing distinct' about them 'except that they were the priestly order among the 'Assyrians of Babylon, as they are expressly termed by He-'rodotus.'* Instead of adducing historical evidence in disproof of Mr. Grote's conclusion, Mr. Rawlinson contents himself with saying, in one passage, that 'the term, whenever it came his-'torically into use, is in fact no unfit designation for the early 'inhabitants of the country,' although he has just before admitted that 'in the native documents of the early period it 'does not occur at all,' and that 'it first appears in the *Assy-'rian* inscriptions of the ninth century before our era (i.e. 600 'years after the supposed fall of the Chaldæan empire), being 'then used as the name of the dominant race in the country 'about Babylon.'† In other words, we have no sort of proof that the title was ever used by the Babylonians of the so-called first empire; and accordingly in a later page Mr. Rawlinson quietly informs us that the name, 'if not strictly correct,' may serve to distinguish the primitive monarchy, 'although there 'is no evidence that they applied the name to themselves, *or* '*that it was even known to them* in primitive times.'‡

This virtual retractation of theories which have been confidently advanced is a cardinal fault in Mr. Rawlinson's writings. With his 'authorities' he deals in the same fashion. 'Hero-

* History of Greece, pt. ii. ch. xix. † Vol. i. p. 70.
‡ Vol. i. p. 75.

'dotus is a very weak authority on the antiquities of any 'nation;'* Berosus is a very strong one. Yet when the weak authority seems to favour Mr. Rawlinson's chronological schemes, he immediately becomes important, while the strong one, when his statements are inconvenient, is immediately shorn of his strength. Bewildered by these oscillations, the reader scarcely knows with what he has to deal, and he may heap together reasons in disproof of Mr. Rawlinson's assertions only to find that in some other passage Mr. Rawlinson himself abandons the house which he has built on sand. In short, for the Camden Professor of Ancient History one tradition is as good as another, and an incompetent tale-bearer will inspire him with as much confidence as the most trustworthy eye-witness of facts.

'A number of Greek traditions,' Mr. Rawlinson tells us, unite in assigning 'the origin of the city of Babylon to the 'twenty-third century before our era.'† We are left to infer that these traditions help him in some degree towards the goal which he wishes to reach; but we are not told that the traditions of men speaking, without authentic historical records, of events occurring ages before in foreign and distant countries, are absolutely valueless. When we come to examine the traditions, we find that among the most important is the series of stellar observations sent to Aristotle from Babylon by Callisthenes and reaching back 1,903 years before the arrival of Alexander. Mr. Rawlinson cannot be ignorant that the series was carried back not only thus far, but stretched, as Sir Cornewall Lewis has noted,‡ over a space of 31,000 years; but it is of more importance to mark his own admission that, instead of being a record, these observations may have been 'a mere calcu-'lation backwards of the dates at which certain celestial phe-'nomena must have taken place.'§ We are next referred to the statement from Philo-Byblius that Babylon was built 1,002 years before Semiramis whom he regarded as contemporary with the Trojan war; and we are informed that if to the latter event Philo assigned the date given in the Parian chronicle, we should have B.C. 2220 for the building of the city. Elsewhere Mr. Rawlinson avers that Herodotus and all other ancient writers are alike mistaken as to the lifetime and the career of Semiramis;‖ and how a computation from a siege which in Professor Max Müller's opinion 'is but a repetition of the daily

* Vol. i. p. 57. † Vol. i. p. 189.
‡ Astronomy of the Ancients, p. 263.
§ Vol. i. p. 202. ‖ Vol. ii. p. 383.

'siege of the East by the Solar powers,' and from the lifetime of a woman about whom Mr. Rawlinson affirms Philo to be in complete error, can help us to determine the founding of a city not in cloudland but on the solid earth, it is hard indeed to imagine. But further, 'Berosus and Critodemus are said by 'Pliny to have declared that the Babylonians had recorded 'their observations upon bricks for 480 years before the era of 'Phoroneus. At least the passage may be so understood.'* Sir Cornewall Lewis understands Pliny to specify a period of 490,000 years, and in support of this statement alleges the fact that Diodorus makes it 473,000 years, and Cicero 470,000, a difference of not more than 20,000 years, 'which, when we are 'dealing with such high numbers, must be considered a trifling 'discrepancy.'† But the date of Phoroneus, adds Mr. Rawlinson, is B.C. 1753, and B.C. 1753 + 480 gives B.C. 2233. The inference is that Phoroneus at least is historical, and we are gravely invited to retrace our steps into an age still more remote than that of a being who, in Mr. Grote's words, 'is said to 'have imparted to mankind the first notions and habits of social 'existence and even the first knowledge of fire,' and whose name is identical with that of the Vedic god of fire, Bhuranyu.

But Mr. Rawlinson can fall back on historical writers in support of these traditional statements. 'There is reason to 'believe that the native historian Berosus intended to represent 'the true Chaldæan kingdom as commencing about this period' (B.C. 2233). Berosus is Mr. Rawlinson's 'great authority.' His history 'has been confirmed in numerous points, and never 'once contradicted by the cuneiform monuments,' while his 'honesty in reporting his country's traditions is unquestionable, 'and has in fact never been impugned.'‡ Mr. Rawlinson is mistaken. 'The view of Berosus expressed by Syncellus,' says Sir Cornewall Lewis,§ 'is that he was an impostor who sought 'to glorify his own country by attributing to it an antiquity 'greater than that claimed by any other nation, and that his 'Assyrian chronology was a figment of his own invention.' This view Sir G. C. Lewis regards as resting 'on solid critical 'grounds,' for not only is his so-called history as improbable or incredible as that of Manetho, but his science was as worthless as his history. But incorruptible though the honesty of Berosus may have been, Mr. Rawlinson has a ready method for setting aside his authority, when his statements become inconvenient. Berosus, it seems, is made to say that 49 kings

---

* Vol. i. p. 189.
† Astronomy, p. 264.
‡ Vol. ii. p. 286.
§ Astronomy, p. 427.

reigned between B.C. 1976 and B.C. 1518, a period which gives not ten years to each king.* This average is 'quite impossible 'in a settled monarchy such as the Chaldæan;' but, of course, in this passage the numbers of Berosus have 'suffered corrup-'tion,' and 'we may conjecture that Berosus, intended to 'allow' either 12 or 29 kings to his third dynasty. But if assertions from Berosus may be rejected as inconclusive, the statements of Herodotus, 'a very weak authority for the anti-'quities of a nation,' become suddenly important when they corroborate the chronology of Berosus for a period preceding his own age by eight centuries.† On Ctesias, the third writer who treated, in Greek, of Assyrian affairs, Mr. Rawlinson will have no mercy. His advantages were singularly great, and they were all singularly abused. As court-physician to Artaxerxes-Mnemon, 'he was likely to gain access to any 'archives which the Persian kings might have in their keeping.' He is contradicted by the cuneiform monuments; his chronology is at variance with that of Ptolemy and Manetho; 'his 'Oriental history is quite incompatible with the narrative of 'Scripture,' and 'he places the destruction of Nineveh about 'B.C. 875, long before the time of Jonah!'‡ Mr. Rawlinson's judgment is unfair and even disingenuous. He implies that Ctesias declined to avail himself of archives to which he might have had access, and further that these archives contained a history agreeing substantially with that of Berosus and altogether different from the story which misled Diodorus. Both these inferences are wholly without warrant, and they are the more unjust as implying further that Ctesias fabricated his history from his own imagination, a supposition quite as unlikely as that Berosus, Manetho, or even Herodotus, invented their versions of Eastern annals. But we have the positive statement preserved by Diodorus that Ctesias ransacked the *διφθέραι βασιλικαί*, the very archives which are assumed to have contained a narrative altogether at variance with the story of the Greek physician. Far therefore from showing that Ctesias was a mere forger, these contradictions between his narrative and that of Berosus prove conclusively that there existed in Persia a version of Babylonish history utterly unlike that which was set forth by the priestly caste of the Chaldæans. The assertion that Ctesias consciously sat down to spin a web of lies from his own brain, is as unworthy of a Historical Professor as the final taunt that he placed the fall of the Assyrian empire, 'long

* Vol. i. p. 215.
† Vol. i. p. 57, and vol. ii. p. 290.
‡ Vol. ii. p. 285.

'before the date of Jonah!' When a historian is thus held up to contempt on the score of falsified chronology, the reader may well suppose that the date which he is said to have falsified is at least as well determined as that of the battle of Marathon. While Mr. Rawlinson is judging Ctesias,* the date of Jonah is treated as if it were absolutely fixed; elsewhere† we find a specimen of his method of modifying or contradicting his own statements, in the admission that 'the date of Jonah's preaching 'to the Ninevites has been much disputed. It has been 'placed as early as B.C. 860 (see our bibles), or from 'that to B.C. 840 (Drake), which would throw it into a most 'flourishing Assyrian period, the reign of Shalmaneser II. 'Others have observed that it may as well belong to the latter 'part of the reign of Jeroboam the Second (Bailey), which would 'be about B.C. 780 according to the ordinary chronology, or 'about B.C. 760–750 according to the views of the present 'writer.' Can any unfairness exceed the parading of a writer's dishonesty with a note of admiration, merely because his statements do not square with the 'views' of Mr. Bailey and the Camden Professor of Ancient History?

When first he enunciated his theory of doctrinal developement, Mr. Newman remarked that the seven notes of the musical scale furnished but a slender outfit for a vast enterprise. 'What science brings so much out of so little? Out 'of what poor elements does some great master in it create his 'new world?'‡ Mr. Rawlinson has done his best to show that the historian also may create new worlds from materials almost as scanty. His 'great authority,' as we have seen, is Berosus; but

'Unfortunately the works of this great authority have been lost; and even the general outline of his chronological scheme, whereof some writers have left us an account, is to a certain extent imperfect; so that, in order to obtain a definite chronology for the early times, we are forced to have recourse, in some degree, to ingenuity and conjecture. Berosus declared that six dynasties had reigned in Chaldæa since the great flood of Xisuthrus, or Noah. To the first, which consisted of 86 kings, he allowed the extravagant period of 34,080 years. Evechius, the founder of the dynasty, had enjoyed the royal dignity for 2,400 years, and Chomasbêlus, his son and successor, had reigned 300 years longer than his father. The other 84 monarchs had filled up the remaining space of 29,980 years—their reigns thus averaging 345 years apiece. It is clear that these numbers are unhistoric; and though it would be easy to

* Vol. ii. p. 285. † Ibid. p. 390.

‡ Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, p. 349.

reduce them within the limits of credibility by arbitrary suppositions, —as, for instance, that the years of the narrative represent months or days; yet it may reasonably be doubted whether we should in this way be doing any service to the cause of historic truth. The names Evechius and Chomasbêlus seem mythic rather than real; they represent personages in the Babylonian Pantheon, and can scarcely have been borne by men.'*

In the interest of 'historic truth' we deny that any circumstances can justify a resort to 'ingenuity and conjecture' in the determination of facts. The supposed necessity for adopting such a course is at once conclusive proof that the facts in question cannot be determined, and that for us therefore they are not facts at all. If all that we know of the reigns of Edward the Confessor, of Harold, and William the Norman were confined to the knowledge or rather the conjecture that they belonged to a series of kings, to each of whom we must assign an average period of twenty years, then in the absence of all details the battle of Stamford Bridge might be placed early in the Confessor's reign, and that of Hastings late in the reign of the Conqueror. In other words, we should no longer be dealing with a history, and all our attempts to construct a true narrative would only plunge us more hopelessly into the bog of 'ingenious conjecture.' But the passage just quoted gives us in part Mr. Rawlinson's theory of historical credibility. The period assigned to the dynasty ending with Xisuthrus is extravagant; it cannot therefore be believed; and Mr. Rawlinson, further, does not like the look of such names as Evechius and Chomasbêlus. We must be pardoned for thinking that his scepticism is not much better grounded than his credulity. Evechius and Chomasbêlus are Greek forms of Babylonish names, and must therefore have suffered to some extent by the transmutation. It is quite possible that ΕΥΗΧΙΟΣ may have been ΕΡΗΧΙΟΣ in the original manuscript of Berosus, and we take leave therefore to identify this monarch with one of the monumental kings. ΕΡΗΧ is clearly the same as the Erech of Nimrod's empire and the Huruk or Warka over which reigned Urukh, the first ruler on whom cuneiform inscriptions are said to throw light. In short, we think that Evechius (Erechius) and Urukh are the same person, and that Berosus, who names none of the monumental kings of Babylon, has transferred the names of two of them to his antediluvian history, that of Chomasbêlus being the other. That the Assyrian royal names are compounds, and that they contain generally

* Vol. i. p. 190.

the names of one or more of the national gods, is conceded. In the name of Chomasbêlus, then, we have the two words Chomas and Belus; and we assert that both these words are found in the name of the seventh king in the monumental series, Shamas-Vul, which Mr. Rawlinson interprets as 'the 'servant of Vul.' * There is nothing, therefore, in the names Evechius and Chomasbêlus to justify us in banishing them to the region of fiction or mythology.

These reasons, however, compel Mr. Rawlinson 'to relegate 'to the domain of myth this first dynasty of Berosus, and to 'regard the historical portion of his scheme as commencing, at 'the earliest, when the first period is closed and kings begin to 'reign whose longevity is not more than human.' † In the interest of 'historical truth,' we again enter our emphatic protest against a method which would render historical research a mere playground for dexterous jugglers, and leave us bound hand and foot in utter helplessness before the Genius of Plausible Fiction. All historical *schemes* are mere delusive meteors, exhaled from unwholesome soils, cheating us with the thought that we have acquired a real knowledge, while in truth we are simply mocked by its semblance. The marvel is that any can be found to feel satisfaction in fixing the reign of a king or the date of a battle on arithmetical computations of averages, or by tabulating a multitude of possible events of which they know neither the causes nor the sequence. But when these childish amusements are put forth as subjects worthy of the attention of historical students, in the teeth of such writers as Mr. Grote and Sir Cornewall Lewis—nay, we will even add of Niebuhr and Arnold—we are almost tempted to give up the hope that the study of ancient history can ever be turned to good account. In the first place, we know nothing of the character of the narrative which Berosus gave with his chronology. It may have been a record of events, every one of which may have taken place; or, like the Roman records even of undoubtedly historical periods, it may have been full of prodigies and other marvellous occurrences which need not interfere with its general trustworthiness, or it may have delineated a world in which gods and men mingled visibly together as in the Homeric poems and the Lays of the Volsungs and the Nibelungs. In the latter case, the numbers which Mr. Rawlinson so diligently manipulates may be the result of that curious process by which Thucydides extracted from the tale of Helen and her woes a political history as credible and pro-

* Vol. ii. pp. 250, 539. † Vol. i. p. 191.

saic as that of the first Reform Bill. Until the character of the Berosian history has been determined, the time of historical professors is sadly wasted in rattling the dry bones of names and numbers which have not even the coherence of a skeleton. If Niebuhr might with some colour exercise his assumed faculty of divination on the rich and varied materials furnished by the traditions of ancient Rome, such a plea cannot be urged in behalf of the reconstructor of Assyrian history, the materials for which are confined to barren lists presented in many inconsistent forms, and to a few inscriptions, for the most part isolated and fragmentary. That national registers should exist at Babylon, Nineveh, and Susa, as at Athens, Megara, or Sparta, is what we might fairly expect; that this registration may in more recent times have been contemporary, and therefore trustworthy, we have no wish to deny; but to assert that the correctness of the later records is a guarantee for the truthfulness of the whole series, is an unwarrantable assumption and a dangerous fallacy, which betrays a deep-seated ignorance of the nature of the historian's office. That Hecatæus is quite as much a historical personage as Asser or the Duke of Wellington, will not be disputed; that his sixteenth ancestor was, as he insisted, a god, no one will believe. In his genealogy, then, we have a list indubitably veracious at the end, and not less certainly fictitious at the beginning. But it is no part of the historian's duty to determine where the fiction ends and where the true facts begin. So far as sufficient vouchers can be brought for the authenticity of the list, so far we shall be ready to receive it as historical. But when Darius or Xerxes swear by the names of their ancestors, it is the merest credulity to suppose that because the first three or four names are those of real men, therefore all the others must be names of real men also. No lists can carry us beyond the contemporary testimony which establishes their authority; and therefore all lists, as such, as well as all chronology dissociated from historical narrative, are altogether without value. 'There is no example,' says Sir Cornewall Lewis, 'of history founded on contemporary regis-
'tration being reduced to mere chronology. The lists of
'primitive kings which appear in the ancient chronologists,
'as the Athenian, Sicyonian, and Alban kings, are the products
'of late fiction.'* It may, of course, happen that names found in chronological lists or epic poems or floating myths, as well as in inscriptions of whatever kind, may be the names of men who

* Astronomy of the Ancients, p. 358.

really lived and did some of the actions attributed to them; and in some cases we may be able to prove the fact. But in all such instances our real knowledge comes *not from the lists, the poem, the myth, or the monument,* but from the historical narrative which enables us to test and to check all the others.

If, then, in addition to the bare lists and chronological schemes of Berosus, Herodotus, and Manetho, we had something like a detailed narrative of events, these details would carry with them no authority and would impart to us no historical information except for events occurring in the time of the several writers, or in ages preceding for which we possess the corroborative and continuous testimony of contemporary witnesses. But for a very large portion of Assyrian history we have no detailed narrative; and the names of the so-called Chaldæan kings, which have been read from the monuments, are not given to us in the schemes of the chronologists. Even in the case of inscriptions on buildings (their right decipherment being taken for granted), the greatest caution is needed. In times of which we have real historical accounts, we know that the hand of the forger has been busy. It is possible, therefore, that Assyrian inscriptions may from time to time have been tampered with, while something must be set down to the score of Oriental exaggeration and the vanity of unbridled despotism. At the utmost then, the Assyrian inscriptions must be allowed to speak only for their own day, or for so much of the time past for which we have a monumental history in distinct and well-ascertained sequence. Mr. Rawlinson's sequences are seldom clear, and for the greater part of the dreary journey there is confessedly no sequence at all.

Thus, then, a mere chronological framework of Assyrian history would for all practical purposes be worthless, even if it had come down to us in a complete state. Unfortunately even this satisfaction is denied to the reconstructors of Chaldæan annals. The symmetry of the Berosian chronology has been sadly marred. Sir Cornewall Lewis denied that we were any the better off for being told 'that Saites, Bnon, 'Pachnan, Staan, Archles and Aphobis, were the six kings of 'the fifteenth Egyptian dynasty,' and maintained that 'we 'should learn as much from an authentic account of the succession of a breed of crocodiles or hippopotami in the Nile, 'or of a series of sacred apes in a temple, for the same 'period.' But in the Berosian 'scheme' we have not even these crumbs of comfort. There are no names; and 'the table 'contains various lacunæ which greatly impair its value and 'render it unavailable for chronological purposes unless they

'can be supplied.'* If apart from history chronology cannot exist, and a chronological purpose in such case becomes a vanity and a delusion, we might suppose that the deficiency is to be made good by the discovery of a contemporary historical literature stretching through the whole series of the ages in question. The process is in reality much more simple. What is needed, is not evidence but ingenuity; the goal is not the ascertainment of fact but the raising of a coherent arithmetical fabric. The imperfect scheme must give way before a better one, and accordingly we learn that 'an ingenious German 'writer has produced a scheme which is at once so probable, 'so consistent with history, and so agreeable to the numerical 'fancies of the Babylonians, that we can scarcely doubt its 'near approximation to that which Berosus actually set forth.' Our doubts would be of another kind. We do not readily see how we should advance nearer to genuine history, even if we could produce absolute evidence that Berosus put forth a scheme expressing at best only the 'view' which, with other Babylonian priests, he took of the historical chronology; nor do we share Mr. Rawlinson's passionate admiration of M. Gutschmid's method of reconstruction.

'Assuming that the division between the earlier and the later Assyrian dynasty synchronises with the celebrated era of Nabonassar, B.C. 747, which is probable but not certain, and taking the year B.C. 538 as the admitted date of the conquest of the last Chaldæan king by Cyrus, he obtains for the seventh, or second Assyrian, dynasty the term of 122 years—from B.C. 747 to B.C. 625. Assuming next that the year B.C. 2234, from which the Babylonians counted their stellar observations, must be a year of note in Chaldæan history, and finding that it cannot well represent the first year of the second, or Median, dynasty, since in that case the eleven kings of the third dynasty would have reigned no more than thirty-four years, he concludes that it must mark the expulsion of the Medes and the accession of the third—which he regards as a native Chaldæan dynasty. From his previous calculations it follows that the fourth dynasty began to reign B.C. 1976, between which and B.C. 2234 there are 258 years, a period which may very fairly be assigned to a series of eleven monarchs.'†

We have here a chain of assumptions founded on an alleged era, 'which is probable but not certain,' and the nature of which seems after all to be as little known as ever. Still Mr. Rawlinson keeps down his misgivings, and reaps his reward. 'Thus much is to a great extent conjecture, reasonable con-'jecture harmonising with historic facts; the *proof* now sud-

* Vol. i. p. 191. † Vol. i. p. 192.

'denly flashes on us.' Again we must say that history is no field for mere conjecture; that no conjecture applied to statements for which we have not genuine contemporary attestation can be reasonable; and that harmony with historic facts cannot be proved until the facts themselves, the very matter in dispute, have been established. Still more we have to insist that the proof (which, if it is to have any value, must be a proof of facts, and not of views of facts taken by Berosus,) is obtained not by the production of new and better evidence, but by ingenious twisting of materials which are admitted to be imperfect and unsound. Such a task, as Sir Cornewall Lewis has well said, 'resembles an inquiry into the internal structure of the earth, or into the question whether the stars are inhabited: it is an attempt to solve a problem, for the solution of which no sufficient data exist.'* M. Gutschmid's 'proof' is, it seems, this:—

'If the numbers are taken in the way assigned, and then added to the years of the first or purely mythical dynasty, the sum produced is exactly 36,000 years, the next term to the *sar* in the Babylonian system of cycles. It is impossible that this should be the result of chance. The later Babylonians clearly contrived their mythical numbers so that when added to those which they viewed as historical the sum total should be a perfect cyclical period. The date B.C. 2234 for the accession of the third dynasty may thus be regarded as certainly that which Berosus intended to assign, and as most probably correct. The other dates in the subjoined scheme, except the first and last, are more doubtful, since they depend on the presumed synchronism between the accession of the sixth (or second Assyrian) dynasty and the era of Nabonassar.'†

These sentences fill us with unfeigned astonishment. We are told first of all, that a certain conclusion has been proved, i.e. firmly established. Then from the impossibility that the result so obtained should come of chance, we are to infer that certain events took place, and that they followed in a particular order, as though no alternative were conceivable. Thirdly, we are informed that the Babylonians, who by adding two sums together produced a cyclical period, regarded the period represented by the later sum as historical—a conclusion altogether unwarranted. Further, we are told that this amended scheme was certainly that which Berosus meant to set forth, and then that it may be regarded as probably correct,—we presume, correct as a historical record; and thus after all we are left, as we began, with mere probabilities, the staple of all

* Credibility of Early Roman History, vol. i. p. 14.
† Vol. i. p. 193.

plausible fiction, while, to crown the whole, we learn that if the first date (B.C. 2234) cannot be indisputably affirmed, all the others in the scheme except the first and last are still more doubtful. This we must suppose is Mr. Rawlinson's idea of history; yet beyond this remains the still more extravagant conclusion, that of two factors in a scheme of chronology admitted to be artificial the smaller must necessarily be historical. For the Eastern mind such schemes have a special and abiding charm; for a priestly caste they furnished a delightful and perhaps not unprofitable occupation. The analysis of some of these arithmetical puzzles attests the exercise of considerable ingenuity, while it also exhibits the play of very varied motives, some subtle, some trivial and childish. The general outline was in all cases easily drawn; but in most instances probably some angle would remain, which it was not so easy to fill with exactness; or the scheme would be filled up systematically so far as the arithmetical idea would allow it to be carried, the remaining period being brought in to occupy the vacant space without much regard to the verisimilitude or the improbability of the arrangement. The latter is the case with the fabricated chronology of the early Roman history. But whatever be the method followed, the symmetry of the whole and not the historic exactness of the parts is the object aimed at. In the annals of the Æscings or founders of the kingdom of Kent, the events take place in an eight times repeated cycle of eight years, the ὀκταετηρίς of the Greeks.* The Fabian computation is far more elaborate; and, to use Mr. Rawlinson's phrase, it is quite impossible that a system capable of such minute analysis 'should be the result of chance.' The destructive criticism which allowed Niebuhr still to place confidence in a shattered historical fabric, soon discovered to him that 'according to the chronology of Fabius, the 'history from the founding to the taking of the city divides 'itself into two portions, 240 years under the kings, and 120 'after them; or, to express it differently, into three periods, 'each containing ten times twelve years, twelve being the 'number of the birds in the augury of Romulus. This scheme 'was the bed of Procrustes to which whatever was known or 'believed about the early times was fitted.'† The first thing to be done was to tabulate the kings, as Mr. Rawlinson and

* Lappenberg, 'History of England under the Anglo-Saxon 'Kings,' vol. i. pp. 77, 109.

† History of Rome, vol. i., Beginning and Nature of the Earliest History.

M. Gutschmid have tabulated the Assyrian dynasties of Berosus. As these were seven in number, the middle of the reign of the fourth king was 'made to coincide with the middle 'of the period assigned to the kings, the end of the year 120. 'Now it is true any number of years might have been arbi-'trarily allotted to him; but what decided for 23 was that this 'number with that of the first secle (of Romulus and Numa) 'makes exactly 100, and that 132, the year in which his reign 'was thus made to close, was the number of the astronomical 'years in a secle.' The details of the scheme can be arithmetically traced for every reign except that of the second Tarquin, the period of which, Niebuhr thinks, 'may perhaps have been 'historical.' Thus the reigns of Numa and Romulus were defined by the heroic secle of 77 years, while, to impart a more plausible historical colouring, 37 years were given to Romulus, because these with the one year of interregnum made up the 38 nundines of the cyclical year, 39 years being thus left for Numa, whose lifetime according to another account is extended to 81 years, the biquadrate of 3. On this chronology Niebuhr trenchantly remarks that it is 'throughout a 'forgery and a fiction.' We have no right, therefore, to regard any one of the factors as more historical than the rest. But according to Mr. Rawlinson's reasoning the Roman chronology from the expulsion of the kings to the burning of the city by the Gauls is *proved* to be historical, *because* the preceding portion is shown to be fabricated for a particular purpose. Happily in the case of the Roman story we have not only a bare list of kings and magistrates, or a bare series of dates, but a detailed narrative, or rather a number of narratives, all of which on examination turn out to be a perfect web of contradictions, while each is more or less at variance with the rest. For most of Mr. Rawlinson's Chaldæans (if they were Chaldæans) we have no narrative at all, while he rejects the traditional history of Ctesias and Diodorus. If, then, we regard with great suspicion the chronology of Rome from the alleged banishment of the Tarquins to the invasion of Brennus, what are we to say of a period of 1,920 years, which is simply one of the factors in a confessedly artificial scheme? If M. Gutschmid be right in his restoration, the method of the Babylonian priests is, after all, only an extension of the Roman. In place of 7 kings we have 222, and for 360 years we have 36,000; and therefore, in the absence of any trustworthy testimony to the contrary, the last stage in the process is as worthless as the first.

Our inquiry into the general character of the so-called

Chaldæan history is here ended. For their ethnology we have from Mr. Rawlinson only some conflicting legends gathered not from Assyrian but from Greek writers, the value of which, whatever it may be, must be determined by comparative mythologists, and from which no historical information can be expected. Their language, we have been told, exhibits features which make it a genus in itself; their annals, such as they are, come chiefly from two sources, one of which (the Persian as given by Ctesias) Mr. Rawlinson rejects as false; their chronology is in great part confessedly artificial; and, finally, excavators have disinterred memorials of some sixteen monarchs, not one of whom apparently was named by Berosus, the 'great 'authority' in Assyrian history. For the hypothesis of contemporary registration extending through a long series of ages there is no more warrant than for Niebuhr's imaginary Roman Epics, while for an Ethiopian invasion, and even for the existence of a nation named Chaldæans, we have no historical evidence whatever.

What then, it may be asked, are the details of this Chaldæan history, for some of which Mr. Rawlinson asserts that he has positive proof; and what do we really know of the monumental kings between some of whom he professes to have discovered relations 'altogether indisputable'? The banquet-table, it must be admitted, is but scantily furnished. The morsels of historical information doled out are hedged round by a formidable array of hypothetical clauses, while here and there some categorical affirmation stands out like an oasis in a desert. Thus after parading the proof of M. Gutschmid's 'scheme,' which has 'suddenly flashed upon us,' Mr. Rawlinson damps our expectations by remarking that the portion of the Berosian history which begins with the Median dynasty of eight kings has only 'some appearance of being authentic.' Even this appearance cheats us, we fear, like morning mist dried up by the sun. These Medes, according to Berosus, seized Babylon, dethroned the old Chaldæan dynasty, and tyrannised over the old inhabitants. 'We can scarcely doubt,' says Mr. Rawlinson, 'that this narrative represents a fact.' He is, however, sadly at a loss to know what that fact may be. The appearance of the Medes in Chaldæa at so early a date is puzzling, and therefore Berosus may perhaps mean only that the invaders came from the country afterwards known as Media. This is a favourite receipt for converting a seeming contradiction into corroborative testimony. But further, Mr. Rawlinson is not sure 'whether we ought to accept the conquest and the previous 'Chaldæan occupation of the country as facts;' and thus these

Chaldæans, who were not Chaldæans, and who were conquered by Medes who were really not Medes, may represent merely some non-Chaldæan race, we know not what, dominating in the country before the arrival of the Cushite emigrants, we know not whence. Distance, it is said, may lend enchantment to a view; but then the view must have either outlines or colours. Here we have neither; and so Mr. Rawlinson, turning away (perhaps with a feeling of relief) from the Median period 'as 'one concerning which scarcely anything has been made out, 'and the connexion of which with the Chaldæans is really 'very doubtful,'* states his intention of beginning 'the history 'of the latter people with the year B.C. 2234.' It begins with an hypothesis. 'It was then, we may suppose, that Nimrod, 'the son or descendant of Cush, set up a kingdom in Lower 'Mesopotamia, which attracted the attention of surrounding 'nations.' Nimrod, however, is not one of the monumental kings, and in addition to the statement from the Book of Genesis Mr. Rawlinson merely refers us to some popular traditions in which Nimrod 'plays a conspicuous part.' But Arthur and Roland, and the Great Charles, play a conspicuous part in the cycle of Western tradition; and although we know a good deal about the historical Charles, and something perhaps about the historical Roland, yet our knowledge comes from other sources, and not from the legends, and, such as it is, it enables us to say that the Charles and Roland of tradition never lived at all. The dynasty of Nimrod, if the Berosian scheme be 'regarded as sufficiently established,' lasted from B.C. 2234 to B.C. 1976, and consisted of eleven kings, not one of whom is mentioned by Berosus or by any classical writer, 'unless we may make an exception in favour of a 'certain Orchamus, who is mentioned by Ovid in his "Meta-'"morphoses" as the seventh in succession from Belus.' Belus, of course, is Nimrod, because Nimrod was deified under the title Bilu-Nipru. It is true that Ovid speaks of Orchamut as ruling Achæmenian cities; but as by Medes Berosus means only people coming from the country afterwards inhabited by Medes, so doubtless Ovid meant Chaldæans while he named Achæmenians. In this Orchamus, whose name may suggest a curious derivation for the *ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν* of the Greeks, Mr. Rawlinson thinks that we have at last a monumental king; but we must plainly say that here, as elsewhere, he has done wrong in withholding the words of the inscription. From sundry incidental expressions we suspect that the whole matter is

* Vol. i. p. 195.

wrapped in not a little obscurity. If the bricks are to be trusted, this Urukh or Urkham was the eponymus of Erech or Warka, where he built a great temple, other buildings by him being raised at Ur, Calneh, 'and Larancha or Larsa, which 'is perhaps Ellasar.' Mr. Rawlinson may be right; but, following his usual method, he tells us first that Larsa is 'the 'Larissa of Apollodorus, where the king held his court who 'sent Memnon to the siege of Troy.'* Apollodorus, however, does not speak of Memnon in the passage referred to, nor does he connect that hero with Teutamus, whose Larissa is not far from Mykenæ. In a later page (203) Mr. Rawlinson, who here speaks with diffidence, asserts without qualification that Larsa is Ellasar. These oscillations baffle all attempts to get at the truth. When Dr. Mommsen suggests† that non-burgesses resident in Rome may have paid to the kings a tax for protection, and then afterwards bases an argument on the fact that they paid it, we can but say that such a process may be fairly called special pleading, but that it is not history.

In Urukh's time, then, many temples were built and astronomy was much studied, *if* the observations sent by Callisthenes are not mere retrospective calculations; and if we may trust the assertion of Ovid that he was the seventh king, he must have reigned about B.C. 2093, because we know (i. e. if we choose to take the opinion of Sennacherib on events which took place many centuries before his own time) that one of these monumental kings reigned as early as B.C. 1860. At length King Urukh died, and *appears* to have been succeeded by a son; but what his name was, Mr. Rawlinson cannot say with certainty. He thinks that it was Elgi or Ilgi, and adds, that 'of this prince our knowledge is exceedingly scanty.' Rather we should say, there is none at all. From inscriptions 'of a comparatively recent date' (how recent we are left to guess), it is inferred that he finished some temples begun by his father, and on the whole he may be consigned to the period between B.C. 2070—2047. *If* these two kings are rightly placed, then we may conclude that they were followed by three other monarchs of Berosus's second dynasty, who reigned from about B.C. 2047—1976. 'Of this period we do 'not possess any monumental records.' In short, we know nothing whatever about them, and we have not even their imaginary portraits like those of early Scottish kings which gaze down upon us from the walls of Holyrood. But 'not 'very long' (how long we are not told) after the time of Ilgi,

* Vol. i. p. 22. † History of Rome, vol. i. pp. 18, 80.

'a change of dynasty took place,' the proof of which is found not in the monuments but in the account of Chedorlaomer given in the Book of Genesis. This sovereign Mr. Rawlinson was formerly inclined to identify with a monumental king named Kudur-mabuk; but Sir Henry Rawlinson, it seems, has changed his mind, and now holds that there were two Kudurs, just as Egyptologists divide Sesostris and identify part with Tosorthrus and part with Sheshonk or with other kings. 'He thinks it on the whole safest at present to regard 'the first Kudur as the original Susianian conqueror who 'established his dominion over Chaldæa, and the second Kudur 'as a descendant of far inferior consequence. If this view be 'taken, we must enlarge the list of early Chaldæan kings, 'and regarding Chedorlaomer as the first monarch of Berosus's 'second Chaldæan dynasty, place after him, probably as next 'successor, Sinti-shil-khak, the father of Kudurmabuk, and 'then Kudurmabuk himself, who thus becomes the sixth known 'monarch.'* Assuredly in comparison with the Procrustean bed of Chaldæan chronology the less elastic apparatus of Roman computation is clumsy indeed. We can but repeat that historical facts are not pieces in a Chinese puzzle, and that we have no more right to enlarge the list of Chaldæan kings than to add to or take from the number of kings who have ruled in England.

From one conjecture we pass on to another. Kudurmabuk II. (if there were two Kudurs) mentions, it seems, a son called Arid-Sin: it is therefore supposed that Arid-Sin succeeded his father, although this fact is not mentioned in the monuments. Still Arid-Sin is consigned to his place. After him the land is wrapped in darkness for forty years, at the end of which Ismi-dagon, it would seem, was the king, his date being ascertained in the following fashion:—

'Sennacherib, in a rock inscription at Bavian, relates that in his tenth year (which was B.C. 692) he recovered from Babylon certain images of the gods which had been carried thither by Merodach-iddin-akhi, king of Babylon, after his defeat of Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, 418 years previously. And the same Tiglathpileser relates that he rebuilt a temple in Assyria which had been taken down 60 years before, after it had lasted 641 years from its foundation by Shamas-vul, son of Ismi-dagon. It results from these numbers that Ismi-dagon was king as early as B.C. 1850, or probably a little earlier.'†

In this singular passage we are called on to accept, first, a view

* Vol. i. p. 206. † Vol. i. p. 207.

taken by Sennacherib of Assyrian history some four hundred years before his own time, and, next, the opinion of Tiglathpileser on the date of a certain temple which he thought fit to rebuild. The existence of contemporary registration between the days of Sennacherib and Tiglathpileser is simply assumed, not proved, and the monuments fail to supply continuous information of the kings who reigned in the interval. If, then, the testimony of Sennacherib, however trustworthy for events occurring in his own time, is no guarantee for events which took place four centuries earlier, much less can it warrant us in accepting statements relating to a time nearly 700 years earlier still. But perhaps the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser I. determine the time at which he lived. Such, however, seems not to be the case; and, in fact,* the date of that king is made to rest entirely on the assertion of Sennacherib. For the reign, therefore, of Ismi-dagon we have simply the hearsay evidence of a king who lived nearly 1,200 years later.

It is unfortunate that Ismi-dagon was succeeded not by his son Shamas-Vul, whose temple at Khileh-Shergat 'implies 'necessarily that the Chaldæans at this time bore sway in the 'upper region,' nor by Shamas-Iva, who 'must be viewed as 'ruling over Assyria in the capacity of viceroy either for his 'father or his brother,' but by another son whose name it is not easy to read. It is thought, however, that he was named Ibil-anu-duma; but we are not favoured with the evidence on which his relationship to Ismi-dagon has been determined. As this monarch was followed 'apparently by his son Gunguna, 'or Gurguna, of whom nothing but the name—which is 'in itself very doubtful—is recorded,' we venture to doubt whether the inscriptions justify the statement that he was a son of Ismi-dagon, or render it necessary to place him here rather than in any other sequence. Of Gunguna himself it is clear that we know no more than we should know of Cleon, if we knew nothing but his name and at the same time doubted whether it ought not to be Cimon. These kings, Mr. Rawlinson tells us, probably bring us down to B.C. 1775; but at this point a change comes over the history, or rather over the evidence. Thus far the order of the monumental monarchs has been determined 'with no great difficulty,' 'from the position 'of their bricks in the principal Chaldæan ruins and the gene-'ral character of their inscriptions.' † Perhaps Mr. Rawlinson may mean that the difficulty is much the same as that which would be felt by any who might wish to reconstruct the

* Vol. ii. p. 291. † Vol. i. p. 209.

early history of England from monuments in Westminster, Gloucester, and Durham. With the later monarchs the difficulty is, it seems, much greater. Their scattered and unconnected records, with the general similarity of their inscriptions, render the determination of their sequence a peculiarly delicate task; and Mr. Rawlinson is constrained to express his regret that 'no writer has left us a list corresponding in Babylonian 'history with that which Manetho has put on record for the 'Egyptians, since we are thus compelled to arrange our names 'in an order which rests on little more than conjecture.' It is well to know the character of the narrative which we are about to read; but however keen may be the gratification derived from the beauty of a romance, the historical student may, perhaps, be pardoned if he should wish to know whether Harold, son of Godwin, be the same as Harold son of Cnut, or whether William III. succeeded William II. on the throne of England. His regret for the loss of Assyrian lists corresponding to the Egyptian lists of Manetho may be modified, if he has any acquaintance with the latter. The Manethonian kings are in number 439, of whom 346 are unnamed, and hence, in the words of Sir G. C. Lewis, 'its general character is that of 'a chronology of anonymous kings arranged in dynasties.' The value of the history may be measured by the fact that the one event which illustrates the reign of Bocchoris, a king who, if real, was removed by not much more than two centuries from the age of Herodotus, is the speaking of a lamb. The prodigy is, perhaps, not very interesting; but some spirit is imparted to the story by Ælian, who informs us that this lamb had eight feet and two tails.

We are now, however, forced to roam through a region of Cimmerian darkness; and we must take what we can get, and be thankful. The monumental king who comes next to Gunguna is Naramsin; but whether he was his son, or his kinsman in any degree, we are not told. 'His date is probably 'about B.C. 1750,' and 'it may be conjectured that he lived at 'Babylon,' because, 'as time went on, the *tendency* was to 'remove the seat of government and empire to a greater dis-'tance from the sea.' The next stage is still more perplexing. 'A king who disputes the palm of antiquity with Naramsin 'has left various records at Erech or Warka.' This means, we presume, that the evidence, so far as it goes, shows that this sovereign is as ancient as Naramsin. It seems rather hard, then, to bring him down to about B.C. 1700. 'It is proposed 'to call him Sin-shada;' but whether there is any reason for giving him this name rather than any other, we are not informed,

but due allowance must be made for historians who are at a loss to determine whether the man of whom they are speaking was Aristomenes or Aristeides. We now reach the *Sin* series of kings; and the difficulty of arranging them may be appreciated, if we suppose that we had the task of arranging a number of English kings, of whom we knew only that the word *Ed* or *Hen* 'entered as an element into their names.' It seems, however, that Zursin, and some other kings of this series 'whose names are imperfect or uncertain,' may be assigned to the period included between B. C. 1700 and B. C. 1625; but whether the sequence is that of father and son, Mr. Rawlinson does not venture to determine. A gleam of light illumines this intolerable obscurity, when after these *Sin* kings we come to Purnapuriyas and Durrigalazu. The nature of the connexion existing between these kings has been 'established 'beyond controversy.' They really were father and son; but what they had to do with those who went before or with those who came after them, does not, so far as we can see, appear. The fact that Purnapuriyas was the father of Durrigalazu (if the inscription on the signet-ring has been rightly deciphered) is about as useful to us as if we knew that George II. was the son of George I., while we were left to guess whether George I. was the son or the brother of Queen Anne. Indeed, it seems to be not quite settled whether Durrigalazu ought not to be really Kurgalazu.* With this passing glimpse the curtain falls (finally, it would seem) on the old Chaldæan empire, if ever there was such an empire. Of the remaining kings two only, it appears, are known by legible records. Of these two, Khammurabi seems to have repaired and built a great many temples; and 'he is evidently king of the whole alluvial coun-'try.'† Of the other, Shamsu-iluna, 'our notices,' Mr. Rawlinson tells us, 'are comparatively scanty.' We have had this phrase already in the case of Elgi, the supposed son of Urukh and other visionary kings; and we know that it is the Camden Professor's way of saying that of these kings we have no notices at all.

We have patiently gone through Mr. Rawlinson's reconstructed Chaldæan annals, partly because a thorough examination of the results of Assyrian exploration is imperatively called for, and partly because nothing less than a careful analysis could justify the grave charge which we have brought against Mr. Rawlinson, that his history exhibits the pretence of knowledge without the reality. We can but repeat this charge,

* Vol. ii. p. 299. † Vol. i. p. 213.

as we read his concluding summary. Of many of the kings Mr. Rawlinson, as we have seen, does not pretend to know so much as the name, while the series of monumental kings is not continuous, and their succession is not determined. Yet their reality and their antiquity may be gathered from 'the fact that 'they are the builders of the most ancient edifices whereof the 'country contains any trace.'* In other words, certain men, for the most part unknown, were the builders of certain edifices which must be very old. But another instance of Mr. Rawlinson's oscillations is furnished by the assertion that 'a 'probable connexion of one of them with the only king known 'from good authority to have reigned in the country during 'the primitive ages confirms the conclusion drawn from the 'appearance of the remains themselves; which is further 'strengthened by a monumental date assigning another of them, 'who is certainly not among the earliest in the series, to the 'nineteenth century before our era.'† The good authority here referred to is the account given of Chedorlaomer, in the Book of Genesis. Now, the connexion of a later Chaldæan king with this monarch would certainly throw some little light on a very dark period, if the Pentateuch clearly fixed the date of the Elamitic invasion. But this is denied by Mr. Rawlinson himself, not indeed in this passage, but (according to his usual custom) in other parts of his work. The date of Chedorlaomer's invasion, as of every other event before the Exodus, must depend upon the lifetime of Moses, from which the chronology is derived by a backward computation. But when Mr. Rawlinson wishes to prove that Nineveh was not built in the days of Bel-lush, Pudil, and Iva-lush I. (monarchs assigned, apparently for no special reasons, to the fourteenth century B.C.), he is content to dismiss the passage in Genesis which mentions Nineveh by name as an interpolation by Ezra after the captivity, and to set aside the date of Moses as 'very uncertain.'‡ Nay, even the subsequent Hebrew chronology seems likewise indefinite and fluctuating. Mr. Rawlinson is inclined to identify Chushanrishathaim with Asshur-ris-ilim. The names are easily transmuted. We have only to change three letters and transpose two others, and the philological feat is accomplished, the present Hebrew reading being rejected as a corruption. The chronological difficulty is at first sight more serious. The Assyrian date for Asshur-ris-ilim is about two centuries and a half after the commonly

* Vol. i. p. 213.
† Vol. i. p. 214.
‡ Vol. ii. p. 303.

accepted date of Chushanrishathaim. Still, our perplexities may be removed, when we remember that 'chronologists con- 'tinue to regard the length of the interval between the Exodus 'and Solomon's Dedication as extremely uncertain, and some 'place the Exodus as low as B.C. 1300, which would bring 'Chushanrishathaim's conquests to about B.C. 1200.'* Mr. Rawlinson is not troubled by the thought that the 'views' of Bunsen and Lepsius do not make the Exodus to have taken place in B.C. 1320 or 1314, if in fact it did not take place at that time, and he is doubtless thankful that an Egyptological theory leaves between Chushanrishathaim and Asshur-ris-ilim, who are supposed to be the same person, a gap not greater than that which separates the Gunpowder Plot from the dismissal of the Long Parliament by Cromwell. This, Mr. Rawlinson seems to think, is no insuperable difficulty. In the chronological sum it may perhaps make no great difference; but as in history we are supposed to deal, not with figures, but with actual facts and the real deeds of living men, we cannot feel satisfied with a process by which Lysander and Alexander might be proved to be the same person.

Passing from the incoherent notices of individual kings to the long line of the so-called Chaldæan monarchs, Mr. Rawlinson is convinced that 'the kings belong to one series or at most to two 'closely connected ones,' 'by the similarity of the titles which 'they chose, by their uninterrupted worship of the same gods, 'and by the general resemblance of the language and mode of 'writing which they employ.' The argument would go far to prove that William the Norman belongs to the same series with Edward the Confessor. But whether closely connected or not, the line of these kings was cut short by an Arabian invasion, which seems to be as mysterious as any of the events which preceded it.

'No details have reached us of the conquest itself. Indeed we do not possess any distinct statement that it was by force of arms the Arabians imposed their yoke upon the Chaldæan people. The brief summary of Berosus's narrative preserved to us in Eusebius does but say, that after the Chaldæan dynasty, which held the throne for 458 years, there followed a dynasty of nine Arab kings, who ruled for 245 years. Still, as we can scarcely suppose that the proud and high-spirited Chaldæans would have submitted to a yoke so entirely foreign, as that of Arabs must have been, without a struggle, it seems necessary to presume a contest wherein the native Hamitic race was attacked by a foreign Semitic stock, and overpowered, so as to be forced to accept a change of rulers. Thus, then, the Chaldæan kingdom perished.'†

---

* Vol. ii. p. 309. † Vol. i. p. 223.

The conclusion is bold, and the speculation may be ingenious, but in history it is scarcely safe. To recur to a parallel already suggested, we may imagine a reconstructor of English history, when the narrative has been lost and some broken chronological tables alone remain, theorising after the like sort on the fall of the Stuarts.

This dynasty (he may say) seems to have given four kings to England and many more to Scotland, when it was expelled by Dutch invaders. Of this invasion we have no details. Indeed, it is not distinctly stated that the Dutch yoke was imposed by force of arms upon the English people. Still we can scarcely think that proud and high-spirited Englishmen would submit to so foreign a race as the Dutch without a struggle, especially when we have reason for thinking that a rebellion headed by one who called himself duke of Monmouth was vigorously put down not long before. It seems necessary, then, to presume a contest, in which the native English population was attacked and overpowered by the men of Holland. Thus, then, the Stuart dynasty perished.

In this theory there would be nothing in itself extravagant, or even improbable. It would simply be untrue. We know this in the case of our own history, and we see the folly of thus attempting to make bricks without either clay or straw. The attempt is not less foolish or the process less fallacious, when applied to the history of a people whom on our own authority we choose to style Chaldæans.

When from this shadowy Chaldæan kingdom Mr. Rawlinson turns to the Assyrian empire, the difficulties of his task induce him to take shelter under the plea of Thucydides, *τὰ παλαιὰ τοιαῦτα εὗρον, χαλεπὰ ὄντα παντὶ ἐξῆς τεκμηρίῳ πιστεῦσαι.* But when Thucydides rationalised the tale of Troy, he did so, merely as tracing the causes which had led to the political conditions of his own age. Sifting with the most rigorous criticism the testimony of eye-witnesses for facts of his own time, he may be pardoned for not applying the same stringent method to the materials of his introduction. But when we have plunged through the morass of Assyrian traditions, we meet with little indeed to reward us for our toil. Here and there, we come across monumental inscriptions, some perfect, many more imperfect. If the testimony of Ctesias is to be cast aside as worthless, because the Persian archives contradicted the Babylonian annals, that of Berosus can retain but little more value, while Herodotus must be regarded at best as a fair witness for traditions current respecting the last scenes in a drama which had closed only a few generations before his

own day. Of the existence of a historical literature we know nothing; and it is useless to balance probabilities or possibilities, when, for all that we know to the contrary, we may be dealing with a series of plausible fictions, or with a narrative in which fictions, whether plausible or extravagant, are so mingled that we cannot separate the one from the other.

The truth is that Mr. Rawlinson's 'distinct original authorities,' Herodotus, Ctesias, and Berosus, are not original authorities at all. They derived their annals or their schemes from materials set before them, of the nature of which we know nothing. In the words of Sir Cornewall Lewis, 'they cannot 'be reconciled by any legitimate methods of criticism, and yet 'there is no satisfactory ground for preferring one to another. 'We are not entitled to assume that any one of our authori-'ties was intentionally deceived by the priests, or that he re-'ported or transcribed his information incorrectly. Having 'therefore no sufficient reason for selecting any one of these 'systems (of chronology), we are compelled by the laws of 'historical evidence *to reject them all.*'*

Still more unwarrantable is the notion that we may safely put up with loose statements and a vague chronology, because the events of which we treat took place 'very long ago.' We agree with Mr. Rawlinson in thinking that 'the parade of 'exact dates with reference to very early times is generally 'fallacious;' but we demur to the assertion that such dates may be adopted 'for the sake of convenience.' There can be no makeshifts for evidence indispensable for the solution of a problem. It is indeed unfortunate, that after all the toil of Assyrian explorers such documents as the canon of Ptolemy should still retain 'a first-rate importance,' and be greedily used to eke out a fragmentary Assyrian canon discovered by Sir H. Rawlinson (or M. Oppert, for with this dispute we are not here concerned), 'which gives the succession of the kings 'for 270 years, commencing, as is thought, B.C. 910, and ter-'minating B.C. 640.' By aid of these documents supplemented with the inscriptions, a list has been drawn up of thirty-five kings, from the seventeenth century B.C., for a small proportion of which the relation of father and son has been established. If this be all the harvest to be reaped on Assyrian mounds, the explorer may perhaps restore their buildings and picture to us their modes of life, but their history as a coherent whole is gone beyond recall.

In truth, Mr. Rawlinson is ill at ease in this historical

* Astronomy of the Ancients, p. 348.

wilderness; and positive assertions are materially modified or even virtually retracted in his Assyrian narrative, not less than in his Chaldæan story. The rise of the Assyrian empire, as distinct from its mere independence, must be synchronous with the decay and fall of the Chaldæan monarchy. To this period accordingly are assigned three kings, Asshur-bel-nisis, Buzur-Asshur, and Asshur-vatila, whom we are invited to regard as real persons on the authority of a tablet mutilated at both ends which 'cannot anyhow be earlier than the time of Shal-'maneser II., and most probably belongs to the time of Esar-'haddon or Asshur-banipal,'* in other words, from a tablet which is only about two centuries later than the kings whose names it mentions. But it seems that this tablet further gives 'the well-known name of Purnapuriyas,' who here furnishes a date for the three Assyrian monarchs, although in the list of Chaldæan kings he fills with Durrigalazu a mysterious gap, without any well-ascertained connexion with those who preceded or followed them. Mr. Rawlinson thinks, however, that the places of these kings may be 'assigned without much 'chance of serious error,' although after Asshur-vatila, 'the 'curtain again drops over the history of Assyria for the space 'of about *two centuries.*' In this unknown period it is just possible but 'very uncertain,' that a king may have reigned named Bel-sumilikapi, of whom, it seems, nothing is known but the name. Still, as it has been thought that he was only the founder of a dynasty and not the leader who established Assyrian independence, he has been placed after these kings instead of before them,—a process much like that of settling a doubt in the history of France by *placing Clovis after Charles Martel.*

At this point the scene changes, and Mr. Rawlinson gives utterance to a feeling of satisfaction akin to that of Livy when he began his professedly authentic history of Rome after the burning of the city by the Gauls. 'Hitherto the history of 'Assyria, so far as it can be regarded as recovered, has been 'made known to us not from contemporary documents, but 'from records of a comparatively late date, compilations under 'the Assyrian kings of the lower empire from the earlier 'monuments which have perished: we now approach the time 'of contemporary historical records.'† But the latter half of Livy's first decade is only less full of contradictions than the former; and the improvement in the Assyrian history is almost less than that of the Roman. The names—and apparently

* Vol. ii. p. 298. † Vol. ii. p. 301.

only the names and titles—of Bel-lush, Pudil, and Iva-lush I. have been recovered from bricks found at Khileh-shergat. Shalmaneser, the son of Iva-lush, was, we are told, the founder of Calah, and undertook expeditions against the tribes on the Upper Tigris. If this information be but meagre, the exploits of Tiglathi-Nin, the great conqueror, may make sufficient compensation. No inscription of Tiglathi-Nin himself seems to be extant, but the authority of Sennacherib which sufficed to fix the date of Ismi-dagon may be accepted with still greater confidence for events three or four centuries later. Between Tiglathi-Nin and Tiglathpileser I. five monumental kings intervene. If we assume that these are assigned to their right places, and that the two sovereigns named Iva-lush and Tiglathpileser are not mere duplicates; if further we allow to each of these kings an average reign of twenty years, and twenty years also for the gap between Iva-lush II. and Nin-pala-zira, we are brought to B.C. 1270 for the accession of Tiglathi-Nin, in whom Mr. Rawlinson discerns the first of the true Assyrian emperors—Asshur-emid-ilin (or Cinneladanus, or Saracus, or Sardanapalus) being the last; and having thus 'approximately, and to some extent provisionally settled the 'framework of Assyrian chronology,' he proceeds 'to arrange 'upon it the facts, so far as they have come down to us, of 'Assyrian history.'*

The history, twisted and tortured on this bed of Procrustes, begins with a migration as well established and yet as mysterious as the invasion which insured the downfall of the Chaldæan empire. The Assyrians, who had once dwelt in the south, had unquestionably moved to the north of the great Mesopotamian plain at a time 'anterior to the close of the primitive 'Chaldæan kingdom.' But 'the motive of the removal is 'shrouded in complete obscurity.' It may have been 'a forced 'colonisation;' it may have been effected by 'a single move-'ment,' or it may have been 'a gradual change;' in short, Mr. Rawlinson might extend indefinitely a chain of hypotheses against which he sometimes raises a feeble protest. On the whole, he thinks that the Assyrians went northwards of their own accord, and were for some time governed by rulers from Babylon, among whom may perhaps be reckoned Asshur-bel-nisis and other early kings who are arranged among the predecessors of the great conqueror Tiglathi-Nin I.

After the death of this monarch, the annals of the kingdom, in spite of the nearer approach to contemporary history, remain

* Vol. ii. p. 295.

in a provokingly chaotic state. Of his son Iva-lush II., 'whose accession probably fell about B.C. 1250,' we have no detailed notice, although 'from the genealogical tablet on 'which alone his name occurs, we may gather that he inherited 'the warlike spirit of his father.'* Indeed, there seems to be no special proof that Iva-lush II. may not be a mere double of Iva-lush I.

At this point the history is again interrupted; but at 'a 'rough estimate' twenty or thirty years may suffice to fill up the gap. The six kings next following are known to us from the great inscription of Tiglathpileser I. Now of this inscription, as of all monuments in which the Assyrian kings glorify themselves and their own doings, we wish to speak with due respect, and we are far from seeking to depreciate their value; but it is of great importance 'to the cause of historic truth' that they should not be represented as saying that which really they do not say. A history eked out with inferences can at best be but a congeries of elaborate and more or less happy guesses. The inscription of Tiglathpileser, which mentions his immediate predecessor, does not, it seems, state explicitly that they followed in the order of father and son, while the Babylonian and Assyrian synchronistic tablet only gives the names of Asshur-ris-ilim, Tiglathpileser, and Asshur-bil-kala 'in apparent succession.' But the nature of their personal relations is, we learn, 'determinately proved by an inscription 'on a mutilated statue of the goddess Ishtar, now in the British 'Museum.' For scholars who cannot resort to the British Museum to verify such facts, the actual statement on the inscriptions should in mere justice be given at length. The first three of these monarchs are confessedly little more than names;† the fourth, Asshur-ris-ilim, Mr. Rawlinson has, as we have seen, so far succeeded in identifying with Chusan-rishathaim as to leave between them the trifling difference of only fifty years in the Jewish and Assyrian chronologies.

The inscription of Tiglathpileser I. reveals to us for the first time the stuff or substance of which the 'contemporary 'history of Assyria' is made up; and, as Mr. Rawlinson expresses a natural satisfaction on reaching the field from which the real harvest is to be reaped, it is but fair to exhibit some specimen of the staple commodities thus procured. That these documents should show the working of any of those political principles which give force and meaning to the annals of European nations, the analogy of all Eastern history scarcely

* Vol. ii. p. 306. † Vol. ii. p. 307.

justifies us in expecting. But unquestionably they bring before us despots to whom the highest of their subjects were as the dust beneath their feet. In their tablets we find great self-glorification and an unbounded confidence in the royal gods, their immediate and unfailing protectors. There are long catalogues of military expeditions, conquests, and massacres; but their lists take scanty notice of reverses and defeats, or by a happy accident break off before the disasters begin. With these lists of nations enslaved and enemies slaughtered, an enumeration of temples and palaces erected, finished, or restored, and of beasts killed in hunting, completes the information which the Assyrian monarchs have to give us of themselves; of their subjects it was no part of their office to tell us anything, and probably there was nothing to tell.

In some matters of taste we differ from Mr. Rawlinson. The inscriptions of Tiglathpileser I. are marvellously grandiloquent; those of some of the later sovereigns exhibit no such exuberance of rhetoric. Mr. Rawlinson follows the former with admiration, as he styles himself 'the powerful 'king, king of the four regions, king of all kings,' the sequel of the catalogue matching excellently well with this brilliant exordium; but his enthusiasm culminates in the contemplation of Tiglathpileser's fervent piety. With all deference to the Camden Professor we cannot think his emotion either edifying or wholesome. After many bombastic prayers to his several gods that they may preserve him in his power and make him victorious in war and battle, this despot breaks out into curses against any who may venture to hurt or tamper with his tablets and cylinders. 'May Anu and Iva, the great gods, consign 'his name to perdition; may they curse him with an irrevocable 'curse. May Iva in his fury tear up the produce of his land. 'For one day may he not be called happy.' There is more to the same purpose; but this 'striking final prayer' is a proof 'of the prominent place which religion held in the thoughts of 'the king who set up the inscription,' and may fairly be accepted as indicating 'the general tone and temper of his people.' Mr. Rawlinson has the assurance gravely to add that we have here 'not a decent lip-service, not a conventional piety, but a 'real, hearty, earnest, religious faith,' the true faith, in short, which animated Louis XI. in his devotions to his sweet Lady of Clery.

The piety of Tiglath, if we trust the testimony of Sennacherib, brought on him a disaster which must have touched him to the quick. In an evil hour he fought with one Merodach-iddin-akhi, a satrap or king of the old Chaldæan capital, and

lost his gods, which were carried away to Babylon. Of this dire misfortune Tiglath himself says nothing; and at this point the light of Assyrian history once more undergoes a total eclipse. Of his son, Asshur-bil-kala, Mr. Rawlinson can say no more than that he 'warred in lower Mesopotamia,' and that 'perhaps he inherited something of the religious spirit of his 'father.' After him all is darkness. 'The history of the 'country is a blank for two centuries, between the reigns of 'Asshur-bil-kala and the second Tiglathi-Nin.' This long period of obscurity Mr. Rawlinson attributes to political depression, and this depression he connects with the extension of the Hebrew monarchy, as though this rise 'could only take 'place under the condition of a coincident weakness of the 'other.' For neither of these theories is there the least historical evidence; and Mr. Rawlinson himself admits their futility, when, speaking of the visionary forms of Asshur-iddin-akhi, Asshur-danin-il, and Ivalush III., the three kings who seemed to have reigned after the long interval of darkness, he says that 'they stand up before us mere shadows of mighty names, proofs 'of the uncertainty of posthumous fame which is almost as often 'the award of chance as the deserved recompense of superior 'merit.'* But if the loss of royal names implies the depression of a kingdom, the posthumous fame is not uncertain or the award of chance.

Ivalush III. (and it is singular that of all the sovereigns who bear this name we know next to nothing) is said to have been followed by Tiglathi-Nin II. The proof of this king's existence is thus obtained. Asshur-idanni-pal, the monarch who is placed next in the series, speaks of sculptures set up by his ancestors Tiglathpileser and Tiglathi-Nin; but as Tiglathi-Nin is mentioned after Tiglathpileser, it would seem that he is not the same as Tiglathi-Nin I., because the latter preceded Tiglathpileser.† The second Tiglathi-Nin is therefore created for the occasion, and put in his proper place, although, with his usual system of oscillation, Mr. Rawlinson elsewhere‡ mentions these sculptured monuments as having been erected 'by the 'first or second Tiglathi-Nin.'

An account of the several campaigns of Asshur-idanni-pal, in which, as usual, there is no defined chronological order, is followed by a lengthy description of his great palace. If the history of the later Assyrian kings swells in these volumes to more imposing proportions, it must be remembered that the bulk is attained by long descriptions of the buildings of these

* Vol. ii. p. 336. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 340.

kings, which properly belong to the antiquarian and architectural chapters. With the separation of all matter not strictly historical, and still more of all matter not derived from the cuneiform inscriptions, the large river of his Assyrian history would shrink into a scanty rill. Nor must it be forgotten that magnificent as may be the narrative of Sennacherib's attack on Hezekiah, we are not only not indebted for it to cuneiform explorations, but the Assyrian monuments are silent upon the subject.

The annals of Asshur-idanni-pal's successor, Shalmanezer II., although not enriched with the grandiloquent metaphors of earlier conquerors, exhibit no lack of campaigns and victories; but while the inscriptions mention the tribute paid by Jehu King of Samaria, they are not clear on the subject of the rebellion which seems to have troubled his later years. As in other places, a number of possible causes, from which we may pick and choose, are set before us; and, if we please, we may believe that 'Asshur-danin-pal, the arch-conspirator,' was put to death, because it is not likely that his father or Shamas-Iva who succeeded to the throne would spare his life. Of Iva-lush IV., who comes after Shamas-Iva, not much, it seems, can be said. Some inscriptions on slabs and statues have been found; but 'as none of these records are in the shape of annals, and as 'only those upon the slabs are even historical, it is impossible 'to give any detailed account of this long and apparently im-'portant reign.' It is a happy circumstance that not many things in Assyrian history are so important that we cannot manage to do without the knowledge of them. It so happens, however, that some of this monarch's inscriptions mention his wife Sammuramit, 'a very prosaic and commonplace princess,' in whom Mr. Rawlinson discovers the queen who, because, as a Babylonian princess (which is not proved), she gave him his title to the regions of the south (which is only an assumption), was first represented as an independent ruler, and then made the groundwork of 'the wonderful tale which was foisted into 'history by Ctesias,' and which he thought fit to throw back to the days of Ninus. The theory may be plausible; but the occurrence of a name in later history is really no warrant for asserting that the person so named has given occasion to a mythical tale assigned to primitive ages; and still less are we justified in imputing to Ctesias the fabrication of a story which he no more invented than Herodotus invented the beautiful legend of the last Lydian King.

The death of Iva-lush IV. is followed by another period of darkness, which is said to extend from B.C. 781 to B.C. 744.

The three monarchs assigned to this period are, of course, mere names; but after these reigns we reach the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser II., which furnish abundant yet somewhat confused information. The dates of perhaps two campaigns are known; of the rest 'we cannot fix even the order, much less 'arrange and tabulate them.' This monarch is followed by a king whose name has not been found in any canon or in any cuneiform record. It is supplied from the Jewish history which speaks of Shalmaneser as king of Assyria about this time. In other words, the history of this sovereign is not derived from any Assyrian source; and a suspicion is therefore thrown on the event which is said to have terminated his reign. If the accession of Sargon was the result of rebellion, it is obvious that we cannot determine the motives of his usurpation by weaving a chain of hypotheses. Yet Mr. Rawlinson, after presenting us with a series of such possibilities, admits that we know nothing about the matter; and we demur, therefore, to the reasoning which determines that there was a usurpation from the mere fact that the name Sargon (meaning the king *de facto*, or the established king) 'shows the usurper.' It may be so; but as we cannot deny the fact, so neither can we affirm it. A catalogue of Sargon's campaigns and exploits, with short comments on each, has been recovered from the ruins of Khorsabad; but the inscription published by MM. Oppert and Ménant, under the title 'Les Fastes de Sargon,' is confessedly not chronological. Another monument, which, it is said, really gave a chronological order, survives in fragments which make the restoration of the document an impracticabe task; and thus the order assigned to these campaigns by Mr. Rawlinson must be purely conjectural, except in so far as the annals themselves represent one event as leading to another. It is obvious that we might have a similar catalogue of the wars of Napoleon; but we could derive from it no real historical knowledge, if we had no means of ascertaining whether Marengo and Austerlitz were preceded or followed by Jena, Leipsic, or Lodi.

On the reign of Sargon's successor, Sennacherib, the cuneiform inscriptions furnish information for fifteen years; they tell us nothing, therefore, of his disasters in Palestine and Egypt, and 'we are reduced to conjecture the causes' which led to his assassination;* but as history has nothing to do with mere guesswork, we pass by these conjectures without notice. In the discord thus manifested within the palace Mr. Rawlin-

* Vol. ii. p. 464.

son perceives signs of national decay, which he had not discerned in the revolt of Sargon against Shalmaneser IV., or in the rebellion of Asshur-danin-pal against Shalmaneser II. But, in spite of these tokens of coming evil, Esarhaddon, we are told, 'reigned gloriously for thirteen years,' the history of which 'the 'modern inquirer has to reconstruct,' from a duplicate cylinder inscription, with one or two passing notices in the Old Testament and some allusions in Abydenus. Among the most important events of his reign was the conquest of Egypt, which 'though concealed from Herodotus, and not known even to 'Diodorus, was no secret to the more learned Greeks, who 'probably found an account of the expedition in the great work 'of Berosus.'* In other words, because Abydenus, who lived after Berosus, makes a quotation from that writer, who lived many centuries after the event in question, therefore the event was no secret to the more learned Greeks, although the memory of it had entirely died out in Egypt (if Egypt was the country conquered) before the days of Herodotus, who lived within two centuries of the time, and although no mention was made of it in the Persian archives, from which Ctesias obtained the materials for his history. The memorials of his son Asshur-bani-pal give no further evidence of the decay betokened by the conspiracy of Sharezer and Adrammelech. The reign of this king, the Sardanapalus of the garbled story, Mr. Rawlinson carries down to B.C. 647, *conjecturally.* At his death, we are told, 'the crown descended quietly to his son, Asshur-'emid-ilin, or Asshur-kinat-ili-kain, the Saracus of Abydenus, 'and perhaps the Cinneledanus of Ptolemy's canon.'† The transformations of Assyrian names are astonishing; but we feel something more than surprise when we refer to Mr. Rawlinson's previous statement‡ that we have no monumental evidence for asserting that Asshur-emid-ilin was Asshur-bani-pal's successor. Of the traditions handed down by Herodotus and other writers we say nothing; but it is at the least singular that even in the reconstructed history the termination of the Assyrian empire is as mysterious and as little known as the ending of the Chaldæan kingdom which is said to have preceded it. The darkness which shrouded the earlier sovereigns gathers again around the last kings, whose portraiture, Mr. Rawlinson admits, must be 'a meagre outline, resting partly upon conjecture.'§ If these hypothetical narratives are somewhat wearying, we have at least the consolation that the story of the last king brings us

* Vol. ii. p. 474.
† Vol. ii. p. 505.
‡ Vol. ii. p. 295.
§ Vol. ii. p. 506.

nearer to the end of our task. Asshur-emid-ilin may, then, have been brave, or he may have been effeminate. He may have enjoyed himself 'unsuspicious of the coming danger,' until he found himself attacked by the Median Phraortes. After the defeat of that king he may have relapsed into his luxurious sloth, and thus allowed Cyaxares to effect the invasion from which the latter was recalled by the irruption of the Scythians. If the laudation of Tiglathpileser betrayed a peculiar idea of religion and faith, the account given of this inroad of savages shows a not less singular idea of law. These swarms, it seems, find their way into the pleasanter regions of the south by a law 'whose 'workings we cannot trace.'

'How such multitudes come to be propagated in countries where life is with difficulty sustained, we do not know; why the impulse suddenly seizes them to quit their old haunts and move steadily in a given direction, we cannot say; but we see that the phenomenon is one of constant recurrence, and we therefore now scarcely regard it as being curious or strange at all. In Asia, Cimmerians, Scythians, Parthians, Mongols, Turks; in Europe, Gauls, Goths, Huns, Avars, Vandals, Lombards, Bulgarians, have successively illustrated the law and made us familiar with its operation. But there was a time in history before the law had come into force, and its very existence must have been then unsuspected. Even since it began to operate it has so often undergone prolonged suspension, that the wisest may be excused if under such circumstances they cease to bear it in mind, and are as much startled when a fresh illustration of it occurs as if the like had never happened before.'*

After this contradictory mystification, it is amusing to find Mr. Rawlinson elsewhere† seeking for a more obvious explanation of the phenomenon. In the highlands of the Zagros mountains certain tribes of Sacæ or Scythians had settled themselves; and these tribes Cyaxares determined to subdue before making his attack on Nineveh. It is possible, therefore, that the Scythians of the extreme north 'may have 'taken an interest in the welfare of their southern brethren,' and thus have come to their rescue; but if this opinion cannot be maintained, then we must regard the irruption as an example of that 'ever-recurring law, by which the poor and hardy 'races of upper Asia or Europe are from time to time directed 'upon the effete kingdoms of the south, to shake, ravage, or 'overturn them, as the case may be, and prevent them from 'stagnating into corruption.'‡ But it is not easy to understand how a law which has come into force only in compara-

* Vol. ii. p. 508.
† Vol. iii. p. 176.
‡ Vol. iii. p. 179.

tively recent times (for recent they are compared to those of Asshur-bel-nisi, Asshur-Yatila, and Urukh), and which has often undergone suspensions of indefinite length, can be 'ever-'recurring;' and if there was a time before which that law had not come into action, what grounds has Mr. Rawlinson for thinking that it continues in force still?

The operation of this law on the Assyrian empire seems to have been followed by a sudden and total collapse, not only in military organisation, but in art. In a land already full, it might seem, of cities, palaces, and temples, Saracus, if he be Saracus, appears to have felt a passion for building, which may be fairly called congenital. But while the structures even of his immediate predecessor exhibit no falling off in architectural design and ornamentation, the buildings of Saracus 'con-'trast most painfully with the palatial erections of former 'kings.' If his palace was left, as it appears, unfinished, we must remember that it was a habit of Assyrian kings to attempt more than they could hope to accomplish; and as the identity of Asshur-emid-ilin with Asshur-kinat-ili-kain or Saracus is conjectural, and, further, as we have no monumental evidence that this sovereign was the successor of Asshur-bani-pal, while the inscriptions fail to determine the name and date of the founder, we may be pardoned for thinking that some doubt is thrown on the age of the building thus assigned to the last period of Assyrian dominion. If the traditions of the fall of that empire are in any degree to be trusted, the last king burnt himself in his palace; and this circumstance may possibly or probably account for the signs of 'a furious 'conflagration' which the palace of Esarhaddon seems to have undergone; but this is no proof that a rude and clumsy building, left unfinished, belongs to a still later time.

The details of the last act in this drama are all conjectural. Cyaxares, after expelling the Scythians, may have 'cast his 'eyes around upon the neighbouring countries,' and so discovered the exhaustion of Assyria; or he may still have smarted under the remembrance of ancient reverses, or he may have received or fancied himself to have received fresh provocation. In short, the philosophical historian may speculate for ever on the causes of acts for which no express motives are assigned by contemporary writers. But while he acknowledges that the closing scene is represented with truth in the pages of Ctesias, Mr. Rawlinson insists once more that 'we cannot 'feel sure, with regard to any statement made solely by that 'writer, that it has any other source than his own imagina-'tion.' The taunt is most unjust. In the absence of positive

evidence to the contrary, we have no more right to bring such a charge against Ctesias than against Herodotus. Mr. Rawlinson must produce the *διφθέραι βασιλικαί*, from which Ctesias drew his materials, before he can be justified in ascribing any portion of his narrative to his imagination. If Ctesias was betrayed into calling Herodotus 'a liar,'* we can scarcely be surprised, although we may deplore the vehemence of the expression. Ctesias had before him a story wholly unlike the version approved by Assyrian priests and kings, and, putting faith in that story, he naturally suspected the Babylonish tale to be a deliberate falsification. It is really too much to expect that Ctesias, having before him several contradictory narratives with no good historical reasons for preferring one to another, would, like Sir Cornewall Lewis, summarily reject them all.

Thus, after the long and pompous parade of cuneiform discoveries, we are as far from possessing a continuous contemporary history of Assyria as we were before a single brick was disinterred from the mounds of Nimrud. Of the monumental kings a large number, perhaps the majority, are mere names. That such kings lived, we may take for granted; but of their relations to one another, of the length of their reigns, of their motives, and their acts, we are profoundly ignorant. Gaps of fifty or a hundred years divide one dynasty from another, and chasms even of two or three centuries sometimes yawn before us, like Tuscan ravines which show the traveller that his day's journey is but half done when he had thought it ended. Dates for events stretching back over a millennium are derived from the historical 'views' of a despot like Sennacherib; while, to crown the whole, a starting-point for the history is obtained by means of arithmetical computation, and to this framework events are adapted and arranged at the will of the manipulator.

We have thus patiently examined Mr. Rawlinson's reconstructed history of the Chaldæan and Assyrian empires. If we have scrutinised it with a minuteness which may be wearisome, we have done so because we felt that nothing less than this was due to the decipherers of cuneiform inscriptions. Mr. Rawlinson has written with a full command of all materials obtained by these discoverers. Taking these histories, therefore, as the matured results of exhaustive research, we have weighed them in the balance and found them wanting. They are neither continuous, coherent, nor trustworthy. Mesopotamian explorers have thrown light on Assyrian antiquities; they have taught us much about the character and habits, the art and

* Vol. ii. p. 285.

science of a people who have played out their part, such as it was, in the great drama of the world's history. For all that they have done in this or in any other way which does not imply the acceptance of arbitrary hypotheses as history, we heartily express our gratitude. All real knowledge has its value, and the zealous explorers of Assyrian ruins are not responsible for the use which others may have made of their labours. We have confined our attention to Mr. Rawlinson's share of the work, and we think that we have made good the charges which we urged against it, as betraying throughout either a complete ignorance of the nature of evidence or a deliberate disregard of every canon of historical credibility.

An examination of Mr. Rawlinson's Median and Babylonian histories would exhibit the same looseness of method and the same uncertainty in results. It is, however, quite superfluous. The conditions of these later monarchies are essentially the same as those of the earlier empires. For none have we the guidance of contemporary histories or the help afforded by contemporary literature; and Mr. Rawlinson's third volume exhibits the same arbitrary hypotheses and dogmatic assertions, the same oscillations and contradictions, which convert his earlier volumes into a clumsy labyrinth.

But if we cannot think this a fitting mode of writing history, we regard Mr. Rawlinson as equally mistaken in his general view of the importance of his Eastern annals. That the Assyrians knew the principle of the arch, that they constructed 'tunnels, aqueducts, and drains, that they knew the 'use of the pulley, the lever, and the roller, and the arts of 'inlaying and enamelling with metals,' we have no wish at all to deny; but we protest against the conclusion that their civilisation is thus proved to have 'equalled that of almost any 'ancient country, and that it did not fall immeasurably 'behind the boasted achievements of the moderns.'* Such phrases do but show that Mr. Rawlinson misapprehends the real nature of civilisation not less than that of piety and faith. Still more earnestly do we enter our protest against the assertion that the art and learning and even 'the intellec-'tual life' of the Greeks was derived directly from the Babylonians. Mr. Rawlinson may, if he pleases, find satisfaction in the thought 'that but for Babylon real civilisation might 'not even yet have dawned upon the earth.'† The genuine historical student will soon be convinced that there is not the faintest warrant for so absurd a supposition. The theory which

* Vol. ii. p. 536. † Vol. iii. p. 523.

traces the science and the polity of the Greeks to Babylon or to Egypt is a mere dream; but we cannot repeat in disproof of such theories reasons which we stated at some length, while reviewing the work of Sir Cornewall Lewis on the Astronomy of the Ancients.* All that they knew of the motions of the planets and the order of the Cosmos the Greeks attained by a patient scrutiny of facts. From the Babylonians they received the precious boon of genethliac astrology and the despicable superstitions which follow in its train. We are willing to take Mr. Rawlinson's Mesopotamians at their proper worth; but we are not disposed to accept assertions in place of proof, or a chronological scheme as history.

ART. V.—1. *Memoirs illustrative of the Art of Glass-Painting.* By the late CHARLES WINSTON, of the Inner Temple. London: 1865.

2. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Painted Glass Windows in Glasgow Cathedral.* By CHARLES HEATH WILSON, Esq. Glasgow: 1866.

'PERHAPS some persons will think I have said too much 'upon the subject of painted glass: I hope not. I confess 'I am delighted with this beautiful ornament in whatever 'place I meet with it, but more especially in our churches, 'where I think that windows

> "With painted stories richly dight,
> Casting a dim religious light,"

'are infinitely superior to the glaring glass of our modern 'churches, and much more suitable to a place of devotion. I 'would merely ask whether the Venetian window, and the 'light framed sash of a modern church, do not strike the be-'holder more with the idea of a ball-room than of a place ap-'propriated to the worship of God? Nay, and I cannot but 'think that the noble old mansions of our forefathers, in which 'the windows were adorned with escutcheons and "goodly por-'traits," as they were quaintly called, had an air of grandeur 'and majesty far beyond the buildings of the present days. 'It is therefore with regret and some kind of indignation that 'I see these beautiful and venerable memorials too often 'shamefully neglected and broken in churches, as well as very 'frequently falling to pieces and unregarded in the halls and

---

* Edinburgh Review, July 1862, No. ccxxxv.

'kitchens of farmhouses, where once they were the honest 'pride and pleasure of our ancestors.' With these words the worthy Philip Parsons, A.M., Minister of Wye, in Kent, prefaces his description of the monuments of that county, published in 1794. If the good old man, who talks so quaintly of the quaintness of others, and gives a new reading to those lines of Milton which never fail of quotation in any writing about painted glass, could open his eyes upon the present time, he would find a different battle raging, and the contest between the adherents of the bright sash and those of the dim old window changed into a war for the rights of England and the rights of Munich.

For our part, we fear that this new controversy may retard, if it does not arrest, the progress of glass-painting. The cause is narrowed to one issue, but this issue is not conclusive. If we are to take the national side and declare against Munich, we lose the benefits of contrast and emulation. If we look upon Munich glass as perfection, and give up all hope of the revival of painted glass in England, we grant a foreign school that safe monopoly which ought not to be allowed to native artists. While one party maintains that nothing can be better, and the other that nothing can be worse, than the Munich glass, we run some risk of getting the worse and forfeiting the better. While our native artists are content to aim at an effect exactly opposite to that of the Munich glass, it is not surprising that the effect attained is often such as to gratify the partisans of Munich. We regret to find that the publication of Mr. Winston's interesting Memoirs on this subject has done much to rekindle this controversy, and that he himself was often led to take a side in a dispute of which his extensive learning and practised observation entitled him to be the umpire.

If Mr. Winston's advocacy of Munich glass could be put aside, and this collection of letters and memoirs studied on its merits as a guide to the practice of glass-painting, we should arrive at a considerable knowledge of the art, and we might partially detect what is now wanting for its improvement. Unluckily, Mr. Winston's contradictions are so great and so easily exposed that few will trust to his guidance. The English mind values nothing so highly as consistency, and is shy of following any one who has at any time changed his opinions. When, therefore, it finds Mr. Winston asserting in 1856 that 'Hedgeland is your man,' and in 1857 that 'the best artists 'are unquestionably the Munich glass-painters;' in 1861 that in execution the Glasgow windows are superior to the Lichfield windows, and in 1864 that in colouring and power the Glasgow

windows are inferior to those at Lichfield; it turns from the book in bewilderment, and sets down the writer as unsafe and crotchetty. Indeed this great and intelligent promoter of the art reaches the last excess of paradox when he declares (p. 253) 'that the state of glass-painting is, in England, at the present 'moment *worse than it has ever been in any other time or in any 'other country;* and that if a great artistic work is required, 'there is no choice but to go to Munich.' We confess that at first sight it is not easy to reconcile these contradictions, though to those familiar with the writer's secret thoughts there may be some explanation. But there is another flaw in the argument which is not so easily detected, and yet is more fatal to Mr. Winston's advocacy of Munich. The Munich glass, as it exists in the church of the Au, in the Cathedral at Cologne, and in the church of Kilndown in Kent, is always coated at the back with a thin layer of enamel, of the colour and thickness of pea-soup, which gives the windows substance and opacity. This custom was denounced as unfair by Mr. Winston; and Mr. Charles Heath Wilson * (to whom Mr. Winston's letters in this volume are addressed) regards it 'simply as a 'trick.' The Glasgow windows were made without its employment. 'No purer or more entirely honest mosaic windows,' writes Mr. C. H. Wilson, 'have been produced since the 'Cinque Cento, the last great age of glass-painting. So early 'as 1852 the honesty of the work of the Munich artists, as 'contrasted with all other schools, was noticed by Mr. Winston, 'and is specially alluded to in one of his letters to me. We 'published the same instructions for the guidance of such 'British artists as we have employed in some portions of the 'Cathedral, but it will be found on several of their windows 'that they have smudged parts of the back of the glass with 'enamel, to give an artificial solidity. Of this, which I regard 'simply as a trick, there is not an instance in the Munich 'glass, every foot of which I have examined as it was un-

* The occurrence of Mr. Wilson's name reminds us that we owe him an apology for an inadvertent omission of his name in the Article on 'Modern Fresco Painting' (*Ed. Rev.* No. ccli.). We said that Mr. Taylor censured the Venetian process of plastering as clumsy, but we had not noticed that Mr. Taylor took this statement from Mr. Wilson's report. Mr. Wilson very properly lays claim to his own discovery; and as his report was the result of a fatiguing journey and laborious investigation, as, moreover, it drew attention for the first time to minute details in the practice of the great Frescanti, it is hard that he should be deprived of the smallest share of the credit attaching to it.

'packed.' The consequence is that the Munich windows in Glasgow are acknowledged to be glaring, and that the Munich artists only departed from their ordinary practice when painting for Glasgow.

This fact is a significant comment on Mr. Winston's recommendation of Munich artists. We do not think that it proves anything more. We do not agree with Mr. Wilson that all dulling of the glass is a mere trick, and we commend to his notice Mr. Winston's view of the practice in one of his earlier writings. But if Munich artists can only produce glass that will satisfy the tastes of their English or Scottish employers, by abandoning the chief principle of their art, we may be sure that the windows they make for Scotland will not be their best specimens, and cannot therefore hope for perfection.

That the Munich glass has very great merits we are not disposed to deny. But we are more prepared to hold with Kugler that the best of it is faulty, than with Mr. Winston that it touches perfection. There is little doubt that we owe the revival of the art of glass-painting to Munich, and that but for the patronage of the King of Bavaria, the technical labours of Sigmund Frank, and the artistic labours of Ainmüller, our English glass-painting would have been at a much lower ebb than it is at present. But that does not justify us in following the Marciana MS. quoted by Mrs. Merrifield, and bringing coloured glasses from Germany, or in stipulating with our glaziers that 'they shall employ no glass of England, but glass 'beyond the seas, and that in the finest wise, with the best, 'cleanest, and strongest glasse of beyond sea that may be had 'in England, and of the finest colours of blew.' *

What hope have we that our English artists will enable us to dispense with Munich, or that the Munich artists will finally adopt our system and come up to our requirements? To answer this question, we must take a survey of the qualities needed for a glass-painting, and observe how they were provided by the ages in which the art attained its highest excellence. Much information on these points is contained in this posthumous work of Mr. Winston's, as well as in his two earlier works, 'The Introduction to the Study of Painted Glass,' and 'The Inquiry into the Difference of Style observable in An-'cient Glass Paintings, with Hints on Glass Painting.' But besides these there are scores of books dealing minutely with

* Walpole's 'Anecdotes of Painting,' vol. iv. p. 66. This was the stipulation made with John Prudde of Westminster, glazier, who painted the windows in the Beauchamp Chapel, Warwick.

the subject or touching incidentally upon it. For the history of stained glass, including the revival of it, we have the German work of Dr. Gessert, who has also written a handbook to the practice of the art. For the German student there is further a work of Wackernagel's, and the 'Minor Writings on 'Art' of Kugler. The French reader will find the history of glass-painting in France told by F. de Lasteyrie, and the modern practice ably elucidated by M. Bontemps. In England we have Warrington's 'History of Stained Glass,' Waring's 'Arts connected with Architecture,' Mr. F. W. Oliphant's 'Plea for Stained Glass,' Mr. Porter's 'Treatise on Porcelain 'and Glass.' The most important feature of glass-painting is treated by Sir Gardner Wilkinson and M. Chevreul in their works on colour, and by M. Labarte in his 'Handbook of the 'Arts of the Middle Ages.' And we have not alluded to the mass of special works devoted to the history of each building in which stained glass is preeminent—works such as the magnificent 'Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges,' or Boisserée's account of Cologne Cathedral.

One thing is evident from all these works, and serves to show us the indispensable condition without which glass-painting as an art cannot have an enduring success. The old painters never regarded their windows as independent works, but as parts of one general decoration. 'In the windows of the 'twelfth and thirteenth centuries,' says M. Labarte, 'the artist 'has had no intention of executing an independent work; he has 'given himself little trouble about a faithful copy of nature; 'his whole aim has been to contribute, under the direction of 'the architect, to the ornamentation of the building; and he 'has never failed of success through the skilful arrangement 'and harmonious distribution of his colours, which, notwithstanding their brilliancy, shed over the interior of the temple 'a mysterious light, adding much to the solemn grandeur of 'the architecture. This harmony of effect did not exclude 'a richness of detail.' Sir Gardner Wilkinson tells us that the old glass-painters considered their windows 'not *pictures* 'or real representations of nature, but simply *ornamental.* 'They used a blue, a red, or any other colour, according as it 'was wanted, and the Prodigal Son is seen feeding yellow, 'red, green, and blue boars, according to the requirements of 'the coloured design.' We may corroborate this observation by referring to the Cathedral of Chartres, where there is a yellow stag in one window, and to the Cathedral of Bourges, where the dogs, that form two couples, are successively green, yellow, light purple, and light grey. And the authors from

whose plates we have taken this last fact—MM. Martin and Cahier, in their 'Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges'—add another which is most significant. They tell us that the populations of cathedral cities knew very well that the monuments were not the work of one man, or even of one body of men, but the work of Christianity itself; a work executed, indeed, by one of its delegates to the department of art, but executed on instructions received from above, and therefore a work the honour of which reverted to its patron. This explanation makes it quite natural for the authors of the 'Monographie' to confine themselves to an elucidation of the hidden symbolical meaning of the paintings, leaving the artistic merit of the painters, and the technical merit of the glaziers, quite out of the question.

Such being the spirit in which these works were undertaken, the works themselves followed as a matter of course. 'The 'palette of the ancient painters was very limited,' says M. Bontemps, 'but with these few colours they produced master-'pieces.' They were content with extreme simplicity, as we see both at York and Cologne. The celebrated Five Sisters of York, as described by Mr. Browne, in his history of York Minster, 'consist of greenish white thick glass, diapered with a 'conventional foliage of the Herba Benedicta delineated by 'brown lines, the spaces between the foliage generally reticu-'lated with the same brown tint; the whole interspersed with 'bands and geometrical forms of pot-coloured glass. All the 'forms and colours seem to intermix like fine lace. The 'glass is about a quarter of an inch in thickness, but time has 'pretty generally perforated it, in semblance to honeycomb, 'and in some instances reduced it as thin as paper.' And Kugler talks of the almost excessive simplicity of the Cologne windows as half displeasing. Yet, he adds, the glow of colour is wonderful in its effects of richness. The whole has almost the effect of a carpet in its wealth of forms; the upper windows are of the richest and most kaleidoscopic variety. It is said that the lower windows in the Cathedral at Cologne were made purposely darker than the higher ones, so that the worshippers might not be dazzled by looking at them. Let us here quote Mr. Oliphant's comparison of the old glass at Cologne with the modern Munich windows, as an apt expression of their radical difference:—

'I remember visiting Cologne Cathedral in the dusk of an autumn night: in that great nave the soft gloom was gathering into darkness; the few figures among its massy pillars were stealing about half discovered; the new windows of Munich glass were retiring,

as you could fancy, into little alcoves of gloomy colour, blackening against the waning light; while high and clear above, in all the sweet purity of its original tones, hung the ancient glass, which had gained, indeed, an ethereal delicacy and refinement from the twilight, but had lost nothing of its power.'

We may sum up the primary requirements of painted glass, as understood and accepted by the old glass-painters, in a few sentences. The windows are not to be independent pictures, but parts of the architectonic whole. The design of the windows is not to be chosen for its intrinsic beauty as a drawing, but for its fitness to be put in glass. Truth to nature is less important than harmony, and drawing much less important than colour. It will be seen at once that these principles are diametrically opposed to those by which pure art is guided, and we can understand the reluctance of modern artists to act upon them. For this reason the decline of glass-painting was contemporaneous with the rise of oil-painting, and the search for effects at once facile and brilliant has been fatal to an art of which the difficulty is great and the brilliance apparently due to mechanical success rather than to the skill of the painter. But until it is recognised that the rules of glass-painting must be observed, and the practice kept entirely distinct from that of oil-painting, we cannot hope for a satisfactory revival of the art. On this point all the writers on glass are agreed, and it will add some weight to our remarks if we produce a *consensus* of authorities, the more that these authorities are anything but conspicuous for general agreement.

And first, we will take Mr. Winston himself:—

'It would perhaps have been fortunate for glass-painting if the art of colouring glass with enamels had never been discovered, as, in that case, the artists would have been compelled to adhere to the system described by Theophilus, and brought to great perfection in the first half of the sixteenth century. The discovery of enamel colouring was made at an unlucky moment, when the world was in admiration of the new style of oil-painting, for it encouraged the glass-painters to hope that they might rival the varied tints of the oil-painters, and share in their popularity. Beautiful as some of the works executed subsequently to the Cinque Cento period must be admitted to be in point of design, one cannot but feel that they were in general painted on an erroneous principle, and that the artist sought rather to produce an imitation of an oil-painting than a glass picture.' (*Winston's Introduction to the Study of Painted Glass.* Oxford, 1849.)

Again, in his 'Hints on Glass-Painting,' the same writer says:—

'A glass-painting is incapable of those nice gradations of colour

and of light and shade which are indispensable for close imitations of nature, and for producing the full effect of atmosphere and distance; and, even if this defect could be overcome, the lead or other metal work would infallibly ruin the picture.'

Once again, in the book now before us, Mr. Winston says:—

'To subdue or lay down the high lights is at once to deprive glass-painting of its chief beauty, its brilliancy and transparency, and to reduce it to the appearance of a bad oil-painting, because, however it may be made to vie with an oil-painting in drawing and composition, it must always be inferior to an oil-painting in the nice gradations of tone and tint, and in that clear-obscure liquid shade which can be given with such astonishing fidelity in an oil-painting.'

Other professed writers on glass-painting take the same view. Fromberg, in his 'Essay on the Art of Painting on 'Glass,' tells the glass-painter that he must not attempt to imitate oil-painting; detail painting in glass is impossible; 'a 'pure and correct style of drawing, united to simple and 'vigorous colouring, are the qualities which the painter on glass 'must, before all things, endeavour to attain.' Mr. Waring's opinion is, that the lead-lines 'give increased contrast and dis-'tinctness to the separate colours and to the entire composition, 'which if not treated in this manner is apt to become confused 'and flimsy-looking, even at a short distance; indeed, it may be 'taken as a general truth that the blending of tints, unless in 'subjects very close to the eye, is to be avoided in stained glass, 'for it is simply labour thrown away.' Similarly M. Chevreul, in his book on colour, says:—

'It is not necessary for an effective whole that the painted glass, viewed closely, should exhibit fine hatchings, careful stippling, or blended tints; for with the coloured stained glass for draperies, they must compose a system which compares with painting in flat tints; and certainly we cannot doubt that a painting on glass, executed entirely according to the system of *chiaroscuro*, will have the disadvantage, that the finish in the details will entirely disappear at the distance at which the spectator must be placed, and that the view of the whole will be less distinct: for the first condition which must be fulfilled by every work of art intended to attract the eye, is that it be presented without confusion, and as distinctly as possible.'

Sir Gardner Wilkinson pronounces that windows which attempt to imitate a painting have all the appearance of a transparent blind.

'No greater mistake,' he adds, 'can be imagined than the attempt to make a large picture on a translucid material. Our faces, our landscapes, and our buildings are not translucid, and glass cannot

give aërial perspective, which is a necessary condition in such a work. The province and object of a glass window in a church are not to present a copy from nature, but to be simply a portion of the general decoration. However well the *imitation* of a large "*painting*" may be made on glass, it is at best not a picture, but the imitation of one.'

We have already quoted M. Labarte on the acceptance of these conditions by the old painters; but one sentence of his remains to be added.

'From the moment that it was attempted to transform an art of purely monumental decoration into an art of expression, its intention was perverted, and this led of necessity to its ruin.'

The reason of all this is very simple. In a painting the first object is the painting; but in a painted window the first object is the window. That is to say, an artistic advantage is taken of something which serves a material purpose, and the artistic part of the work is necessarily subordinate to the material. It is a manifest anomaly to have 'rich windows that exclude the light,' for the use of a window is to admit the light. But if the window is to be turned into a picture, an imitation of objects on which the light falls, but through which the light does not pass, this use is sacrificed. At the same time the employment of figures in windows is perfectly legitimate, if there is no attempt in them at artistic illusion. As it is the first duty of a window to let in the light, so it is the first duty of the glass-painter to consult the nature of his materials. And if he disguises the true nature of glass by making it opaque, he not only keeps out the light which ought to play through it, but he uses glass unnecessarily. For, owing to the difficulties of glass-painting, no one would choose glass as a material where he had the choice of any other. It would be better to paint at once on the wall, than to reduce the window to the appearance of the wall. And in such a case, as in that of West's windows in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, there is nothing but the lead-work to tell that you are not looking at an ordinary painting. That a man should voluntarily undertake the difficulties of glass-painting in order to produce an effect exactly similar, but utterly inferior to that he would produce with another method, is one of those works of pious supererogation which seem so laudable to superstition, but which on earth are so hopelessly barren.

We do not at all exaggerate the difficulties of glass-painting. Those difficulties are proved by the numberless attempts which have been made to master the art, and the equally numberless failures. Comparing modern glass with ancient, many have been tempted to believe that the ancients had some secret which

has not been handed down. The mystery made of glass-painting in earlier times tends to confirm this belief. In the seventeenth century even the writers who furnished the public with information on the arts, reserved for themselves what was most useful. The brothers Crabeth, who painted some of the windows in the church of Gouda in Holland, were exceedingly reserved in all that related to their own practice. 'So much so, indeed,' says Mr. Weale, 'that whenever one 'brother inquired of the other how he had produced such or 'such an effect, the only answer was, "I found it out by acci-'dent, or by trial;" and they were so afraid of their secrets in 'art being divulged that they would never speak of their works 'in the presence of a third person.' It is true these early painters had a secret, and it is one we have not yet been able to discover. Mr. Winston tried to discover it by analysing the glass of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He writes in some exultation to acquaint a friend with his success in reproducing the old materials. He employed a first-rate chemist, and the result was that 'we have beat the French glass-makers 'so hollow that it is quite laughable.' But when all this was done, it was plain that the strength of the old glass did not lie purely in the manufacture. The secret was still deeper. It was the secret of Opie, who was asked how he mixed his colours, and replied, 'With brains.' It was the secret of Haydn, who was asked why he adopted certain combinations, and replied that he chose them because they had a good effect. After stating that he has not given any account of the method adopted in glass-painting, because there were no secrets in it, M. Bontemps concludes:—

'All that we know for certain is that the ancients, with the palette which we call incomplete, produced effects of harmony to which we have not yet attained. People have imagined that this was owing to the quality of their colours; while it was really the result of the well-balanced power of the different colours, and of their artistically combined oppositions. *This is the secret that we have not yet been able to discover.*'

In M. Bontemps' opinion—and that we should attach great importance to this opinion is explained by the position M. Bontemps held as director of the glass-works at Choisy, and the service he rendered to the art of glass-painting by reviving the manufacture of ruby—the one thing needed for modern glass-painting is a great artist and the formation of a school of painters under his presidency. And it is this one thing on which we can hardly count. The philosophy of history often assures us that when the world is ripe for an event to happen,

the man to whose hands the conduct of the event is to be entrusted is sure to make his appearance. This theory is admirable when the facts have already occurred, but there is one objection to it. The appearance of the man is the first sign that the world is ripe for his mission. Till the man appeared and did his work, the world was unconscious that the work was to be done, or indifferent to its being done. And the proof is, that when others tried to do the work before and failed in it, the world was not ripe for them. Certainly, such an art as glass-painting requires faculties which are often wanting in painters. When our painters took up the art of fresco, they found themselves often the slaves of their materials; yet the technical difficulties of fresco are as nothing compared with those of glass-painting. A master who is to preside over a school of glass-painters—anyone, indeed, who draws a cartoon for a painted window—must not only give the highest expression to his idea as far as art is concerned, but must bear in mind each technical detail of the glass, and must make his thoughts at once bend and be rigid, like the leading. The fault which Kugler finds with the windows in the church of the Au at Munich is that the cartoon was prepared without due regard to technical considerations. If the cartoon is even made without regard to the special window in which the glass is to be placed, there may be flagrant sins against good taste; nothing can be more repulsive than the sight of mullions cutting the figures in two, or passing through the arms of the crucified Saviour.

Such blemishes as these may of course be easily avoided. But it is not so easy to reach the highest excellence. The artist who would excel in glass-painting must be content with little, and must give much for that little. He must endeavour to make himself useless, as was said of a good teacher. His object must be to leave the windows to speak for him, and to retire himself into the background. For the moment that we begin to forget the windows in the artist, we are paying him a false compliment. Yet there are few artists to whom this false compliment would not be acceptable; few who would speak with the noble self-abnegation of Thorwaldsen when undertaking the restoration of the Ægina marbles: 'It is a thankless 'task to restore antique works, for if it be not well done, it 'were better left undone; and if it be well done, it is as if 'nothing had been done.' Henri Beyle says of Rossini, that he had to mutilate the most beautiful ideas in the world, because the tenor could not reach the note required, or the prima donna always sang out of tune in passing from one note to

another. This may apply to any art where the design and execution are in different hands, but it applies most forcibly to glass-painting.

'The necessity of leading a glass-painting together,' says Mr. Winston, 'is one of those conditions which cannot be evaded by any ingenuity. The lead-work and saddle-bars must be accepted as necessary parts of the composition; the design must be made with reference to them, and that glass-painting must be acknowledged to be the best, which admits of the leads being thrown into the outlines, and made to serve as outlines, and which, by the simplicity, I might almost say roughness, of its design and execution, prevents the harshness of the saddle-bars from being obtrusive. In this respect the glass-paintings prior to 1550, and until the eighteenth century, must be considered superior to those later works in which the attempt has been made to ignore the leads and saddle-bars by leading the work together in squares, independently of the outline of the composition, or by twisting the saddle-bars, so as to avoid their cutting the design at regular intervals; because both methods immediately suggest the idea of a blemished picture, and make us immediately perceive how much better the work would be without leads or saddle-bars. But a window cannot be constructed without them.'

Even when these necessities of his art have been taken into consideration by the glass-painter, the effect of the window depends very much on the quality of the glass employed. It was to this that Mr. Winston devoted himself almost exclusively. 'It is in the glass-house,' he said, 'and in the glass-'house alone, that we can hope for any real improvement in 'the effect of glass-paintings.' With this view he made the analyses of ancient glass to which we have alluded. With this view he studied the texture of glass so carefully that he could at once detect the age of a window. So intent was he on this favourite subject that once when he was travelling in Germany he saw a piece of ancient stained glass in the window of an inn where the horses were baiting. He at once examined it and made a note on it, introducing it soon after as an example of a peculiar style in his inquiry into the differences of style. And he always insisted on the necessity of studying the texture of the glass contemporary with any style before attempting to imitate it.

'I am thus minute,' he says, 'in noticing specimens calculated to show in a striking manner the difference in texture between glass of different dates, because, of all differences, this is the least appreciable by casual observers, though all who have studied ancient painted glass will agree that it is one of the most important.'

Again:—

'At Chester Cathedral two modern picture-windows have lately

been put up—the one is in imitation of early decorated, the other of perpendicular glass; but notwithstanding the great difference of their detail, both windows are immediately perceived to be of the same date, because glass alike in texture has been used in the formation of each.'

The conclusion to which Mr. Winston was led by his study of the materials was one confirmed by such glass-makers as M. Bontemps and Mr. Apsley Pellatt, and by such writers on glass as M. F. de Lasteyrie. It was that the perfection to which the manufacture of modern glass had been brought was the chief obstacle to the success of glass-painting. At first sight this will seem a contradiction. But it is explained when we examine the glass of the ancients, and when we observe how unsparingly the use of white glass in coloured windows is condemned by Sir Gardner Wilkinson. 'It should be laid 'down as a rule that no glass should be white in a coloured 'glass-window, except when absolutely *required as part of the* '*composition;* and wherever a simple space or edging is to 'be introduced without being of any positive hue, it should be 'of a neutral tint like the subdued greenish hue of partially 'bleached glass.' White glass, M. Bontemps tells us, obscures or extinguishes the other colours, and makes a hole in the window. The white glass used by the ancients was of a horny green, owing to the impurity of the materials used in its composition. Mrs. Merrifield says it is generally considered that the earliest glazed windows were filled with stained glass because it required more skill to make colourless glass than to tinge it with some of the ordinary colours. And Mr. Apsley Pellatt thinks it

'somewhat remarkable that while clearness of metal constitutes the greatest improvement in flint-glass, the reverse should be the case for window-glass; in fact, that while homogeneity should be the essential property of flint-glass, impurity is equally necessary for the successful imitation of the ancient glass, in attaining the same depth of colouring and the absorption of the rays to be found in the coloured glass of the thirteenth century; it therefore seems anomalous that the inferior fuel for melting the materials, also that the metals, sand, and alkali possessed by the ancients, which were less pure than those used by the moderns, should have furnished greenish-white and potmetal coloured glass, so exactly suited to produce the best effects for pictorial windows.'

The same authority considers that Mr. Winston's glass, made for the Temple windows by Messrs. Powell and Sons of Whitefriars, was equal to the old glass in colour; and we therefore hold that if glass is specially made for painting, the objection of too great transparency may be removed. But the

present existence of this objection is a full answer to those German writers who look upon the revival of glass-painting as more than a *fait accompli*. One of them tells us that there was no such thing as real glass-painting before the fifteenth century; another that modern glass-painting is almost entirely of late origin. Herr Fromberg does not for a moment doubt that our system of manufacturing glass produces far more perfect results than the ancient system, certainly as far as regards its transparency, whiteness, and clearness, and generally with respect to all those qualities which are peculiar to glass. 'And 'if, on the other hand, we compare fragments of old painted 'glass with that which we manufacture at the present day, it 'will appear in the most convincing manner that our painted 'glass is not in the slightest degree inferior in point of colour to 'that of the ancients.' If the writer is satisfied with white glass, glaring colours, and both these defects overcome by dulling the back of the glass with cement, so as to deprive it of all those qualities which are peculiar to glass, we grant him the modern German superiority.

One of the most striking features of modern German glass, as compared not only with ancient glass, but with modern English, is its extreme thinness. This makes it almost impossible to get depth or richness of colour without dulling the back of the glass, and it is a question if the glass itself has strength to endure. The windows on the south side of Kilndown Church have been supported by thick plate-glass at the back, to guard them from the wind. One windy day, during service, it seemed as if they would blow in, and one of them cracked slightly at the top. The plate-glass at the back has indeed a pleasant effect, as it gives the back of the windows the smooth and liquid appearance of which they are deprived by the thin coat of cement, like pea-soup in colour and consistency. But the cracking of the window shows the advantage of thick glass, just as the flakes of colour peeling off the dress of Charles I. in one of the west windows, show the superiority of mosaic over enamel. Mr. Winston rejoices that the Munich school, 'after nearly half a century spent in 'the consistent treatment of glass-painting as a branch of fine 'art, has lately abandoned the vicious practice of colouring 'glass with enamels for the purer though infinitely more 'difficult method of the Renaissance.' We question very much if the mosaic method can be properly carried out with the thin glass that Munich has hitherto employed, or if their pictures will ever be anything but glaring, except when made opaque by an external coating.

Mr. Winston had praised the windows of Kilndown Church, and those of the church in the Au, as fine specimens of the practice of the modern Munich school. But even in these he says there is a dulness and opacity, a want of brilliancy owing to the absence of clear lights and transparent shadows. It is difficult to tell how far this opacity results from the use of enamel colours, how far it is caused by the coat of cement. One thing is certain, that there is no transparency in the figures, nothing to tell that they are made of glass. The effect of the dresses is certainly that of enamel colours, and, as we just remarked, the colour is peeling in small flakes off the dress of Charles I. There are indeed some glassy effects in the canopies, especially in the east window, calling up with a slight variation the lines in the Palace of Art:—

> 'Likewise the deepset windows, stain'd and traced,
> Would seem slow-flaming crimson fires
> From shadow'd grots of arches interlaced,
> And tipt with frost-like spires.'

But except in the east window, where the depth is quite an illusion, the rest of the Kilndown paintings have little to distinguish them from oil-paintings. The faces are as finished as faces in oil, and there is not a high light visible. Much the same remark is made by Kugler about the windows in the Au, save that the leading is more skilfully managed at Kilndown.

'The colours,' he says, 'do not harmonise; the faces are very delicately painted, while the draperies are rich and decided in colour; the red in the draperies is very powerful, while the violet and green* are almost cold. The leading does not suit the very delicate treatment of the details, or even the contours of the figures.'

Yet if the Munich school is to be taken on its own ground, and not on that which was prescribed for it by a rather arbitrary set of employers, these windows at Kilndown and those in the Au must weigh more with us than the windows at Glasgow. It is impossible to forget that in painting for Glasgow the German artists accepted conditions new to them, and made haste to throw off their fetters when the work was over. Mr. Wilson himself 'regrets much to hear that the 'better method of execution which we succeeded in enforcing 'has been so soon abandoned.' We are rather inclined to wonder that the artists yielded for a time to such pressure. From Mr. Wilson's 'Memoir of the Glasgow Cathedral Painted

* This fault was so much felt by the Glasgow Committee that the use of more harmonious greens was urged on the Munich artists, and at length adopted.

'Windows' we learn that not only were the windows to be pure mosaics, but Roman Catholic artists were to act as vehicles of Presbyterianism:—

'It must not be forgotten,' wrote the Committee, 'that Glasgow Cathedral is a temple dedicated to the religious services of the Established Church of Scotland. The Established Church of Scotland is a Protestant and Presbyterian Church. According to the principles and practice of this church, no representations in painting or sculpture are anywhere admitted for religious purposes. The services are very simple; there is no pomp, no symbolism; and there is the greatest repugnance to the symbolism of Rome. You must therefore avoid in every case using any symbol adopted in Roman Catholic churches.'

These symbols are then specified:—

'Besides, no nimbus or aureole is to be placed round the head of any saintly person represented.' . . . 'Apostles must not be distinguished by keys, swords, pilgrims' staves, escallop-shells, &c.; nor are any to be clothed in the costume of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. No representation of God the Father, of the Holy Trinity, or of the Holy Ghost, or of the Virgin Mary as the "Mother of God."'

Mr. Wilson adds, 'At this time this was carried so far that 'no direct representation of the Saviour was contemplated.' To such restrictions as to the character of the subjects were added others as to the size of the figures and the backgrounds. It was wise to remonstrate against the use of enamels in such a climate as Glasgow, where 'the floating filth would inevi-'tably adhere to the glass, and would entirely destroy its 'brilliancy.' But when Germans were tied down to paint for Scotchmen, and Roman Catholics for Presbyterians, when the thin glass of Munich was to be treated according to the English method, and the whole cycle of the Christian faith depicted by a strict historical treatment, the difficulties of glass-painting were increased to such a degree that the result may well seem a miracle.

What M. Bontemps says of the Munich glass may well find a place here, and must be the more esteemed as he is in a position to speak with impartiality:—

'We should be unjust if, in these pages devoted to glass-painting, we omitted all mention of the windows executed at the Royal Manufactory at Munich. The King of Bavaria, who has managed to give so great an impulse to painting and sculpture in his dominions, has also wished to mark his reign by the revival of glass-painting. Artists of the highest merit have entered into his views, some for the designs of the subjects, others for the ornamentation. The most beautiful tints of coloured glass have been manufactured; they have

not only coated white with coloured glass, but they have coated colour with colour, and thus produced the richest palette that has ever come into the hands of the glass-painter. After seeing the church of the Au, a suburb of Munich, we may say that no windows have been better executed in our day, or by more skilful hands. Still, in our opinion, the execution of these windows forms their chief merit. In this respect they are analogous to the windows of the sixteenth century. The composition is quiet, religious; we notice in it the skilful drawing of the school of Munich; but the ornamentation is without charms; the whole work leaves us cold, and does not recall the magic of the ancient glass. And yet there are means of execution here which are far superior to those of past centuries, means with which an artist of those times would have created marvels.'

Every line in the present paper bears out this remark. The Munich artists have never been content to produce windows; they have always aimed at making pictures. However well they may have succeeded in reaching the goal they aim at, however popular their works may be with their own countrymen, the goal is not that proposed in our churches, nor are the works suited to our taste. We believe that, as a rule, the very persons who may be expected to admire the Glasgow mosaics will prefer the painted glasses of Munich and Kilndown. Nor is this strange. We always find that works executed on the principles chosen by their authors express the mind of their authors more truly than works made to order. Then, though we may object to the principle adopted in the Au, we must own that the works themselves are genuine. In Glasgow the principle is good, but the use of it has been forced upon the painters. The complaint made against Munich windows by critics of glass is that they seem painted on some other material. The complaint generally made against the Glasgow windows is that their colours are too bright—too fierce, Mr. Winston calls them. It is well that the Munich artists should have recognised the necessity of high lights in glass, but there is no need for their going to such an inaccessible height that the eye cannot follow them. Of this Mr. Winston seems to have been fully aware, from the process of reasoning he went through to convince Herr Ainmüller of the necessity of an improved material. It is painful to see him throw overboard his whole artistic education, and admit that he was more pleasurably affected by the harmonies of the Glasgow windows than by any of the old ones. But at the same time he defers to the prejudices of the vulgar, amongst whom he might himself have formerly been ranked. He suggests, in his very mildest tones, that the richness and depth

of colour in the old windows makes them prized alike by the most learned and the most ignorant; 'and causes the latter to 'be easily blinded to the defects of modern glass-painting, pro- 'vided that by means of scumbling and other unlawful expe- 'dients, the glass is somewhat toned down from its original 'fierceness.' Then, as if this admission was not enough, he adds: —

'I have no sort of doubt that if the Glasgow windows were smeared over with brown paint and wax, to their ruin as works of art, they would gain in the estimation of ninety-nine out of every hundred spectators, from some of whom we might reasonably expect better judgment; *but this shows how important an ingredient in glass-painting is colour of a fine rich subdued tone, and how foolish it is for great artists to neglect taking the only practical steps for obtaining it.*'

Here, again, we might convict Mr. Winston out of his own mouth. In his 'Hints on Glass-Painting,' he says that he does not condemn all dirtying or antiquating of glass whatever, but only the abuse of the practice. A slight obscuration he thinks advantageous, as increasing, though not producing harmony. Mr. Warrington maintains stoutly that painting the glass on the exterior was known to, and practised by, the ancients; and alludes to a window of the early part of the fourteenth century, which he restored, and which was shadowed entirely on the outside. Yet all that Mr. Winston advocates in his earlier work, and some of his earlier letters, is an artistic attempt at giving to modern glass that film which age imparts to ancient glass. This he admits to be a hazardous experiment, for 'age produces a broken dulling, not a uniform 'dulling like art.' (*Winston's Memoirs*, p. 24.) The modern process is 'to bedaub the whole individual piece, and then to 'rub away some of the dirt in the centre of the piece; 'whereas Nature bedaubs the centre of the piece, leaving 'in general a considerable space near the leads, all round the 'edges, comparatively clear.' (*Memoirs*, p. 45.) In his 'Hints 'on Glass-Painting,' he says, 'I believe that nothing is more 'difficult to imitate in practice than the mellowing effect of 'age upon a glass-painting. The film produced on the glass by 'a slight decomposition affecting both surfaces of the sheet, 'and the adhesion of ferruginous particles derived from the 'saddle-bars, and of various minute lichens and mosses in- 'visible to the naked eye, is through the superior delicacy of 'Nature's operations more transparent than any yet produced 'by artificial means.' If these artificial means, this dulling, this bedaubing, be unlawful, and cause the ruin of windows as

works of art, why should Mr. Winston take such pains to ruin them artistically?

No doubt by the time that age has shed its mellowing influence on the Glasgow windows, their harmonies of colour will have a better chance of being appreciated. But this was not the spirit in which the old glass-painters executed their works. The appeal to posterity is only valid in the presence of posterity, and is never accepted as an escape from the judgment of contemporaries. It is true, as Mr. Mill said in the House of Commons, that if men never wrote for posterity we should not have had Shakspeare, or Milton, or Wordsworth; but because in these cases the first verdict was reversed it does not follow that it will be reversed in all cases. By the time the Glasgow windows are sobered down, England may have produced a great glass-painter; and our descendants may look on the Munich glass of the middle of the nineteenth century as we look on the enamelled glass of the end of the eighteenth. Very different was the case when the painted glass was called the book of the laity, and when the catechism used in some of the dioceses of France instructed the congregation to look at the windows as furnishing food for thought while the mass was being said. Those artists knew that they must instruct the present if their teaching was to be handed down to posterity. They did not abdicate their true functions in the hope that posterity might reinstate them. And they may be supposed to have taken that view of posthumous fame which was afterwards expressed by Schiller:—

> 'Wer den Besten seiner Zeit genug
> Gethan, der hat gelebt für alle Zeiten.'

It may be objected that the chances of England producing a great glass-painter are very small—so small indeed as not to be worthy of discussion. We do not deny the force of this objection, nor do we look for the appearance of such a man as the only hope for English glass-painting. In our judgment, glass-painting has greatly improved since the first steps were taken to revive the art, and we do not despair of further advances. We are quite willing to learn from Munich, though we do not wish to give Munich a monopoly of our church windows. But allowing this, we think our progress must necessarily be slow. It may seem to have been comparatively rapid when we think of the present number of glass-painters, the works they have done, and the praise that some of them have earned. In 1768, as we learn from Levieil, there was only one glass-painter in Paris; and he found so little employment, that he

could not have supported his family by his art if he had not at the same time driven a trade in glass. But though the profession thrives, it does not follow that the art has made a similar advance. Its difficulties are so great, and the changes made in the practice since Theophilus described it are comparatively so small, that even a man with the most decided genius for glass-painting would find himself hampered in all directions. The best proof of this will be found in a description of the modern process of glass-painting, with occasional reference to the process of earlier ages.

As we are considering Mr. Winston's book, it will be convenient to adopt his nomenclature. And his definition of the three methods of glass-painting is as follows. In the mosaic method, he says, the local colouring of the picture is produced by means of glass coloured in its manufacture, the shadows and outlines only being executed with enamel brown. In the enamel method, the colouring of the design is effected by using enamel colours. And in the mosaic enamel method the colouring is produced by a combination of the two former methods. The objection to the mosaic method is its stiffness; to the enamel method its opacity. There is a further objection to modern mosaic glass, which we have stated already; the extreme whiteness and transparency give the glass a flimsiness and thin look, which are antagonistic to all effects of colour. Nevertheless, the mosaic system has by this time superseded the enamel, and we shall confine ourselves to an account of the former.

The first step towards the production of a glass-painting is the preparation of a cartoon. The painter must ascertain the shape and situation of the window, and make a small drawing, which is probably coloured before the dimensions of the window are taken, and the full-sized cartoon is drawn from it. In this respect the moderns have very naturally improved on the ruder practice of the ancients, and the greater skill of modern workmen enables them to dispense with much of the help given to the ancient workman by the artist. According to Theophilus, the artist had a wooden table whitened with pulverised chalk and sprinkled with water. On this table he marked out with a rule and compass the exact size of the window; and then sketched out, first with lead or tin, and afterwards with a red or black colour, the subject to be represented. He also marked the borders and ornamental parts, expressing the shadows by hatchings corresponding to the enamel brown which would be applied to the glass. The colours were either applied to the table, or noted down on the table by a conventional letter

which referred to a given colour.* In modern practice the workman is often skilful enough to dispense with such an indication. The small coloured drawing instructs him as to the colours, though one would think a microscopic eye was needed to distinguish one from the other. In some cases, too, the names of the colours are written on the cartoon. At other times some parts of it are coloured in full, that the painter may gain a more exact idea of the general effect.

When the cartoon is prepared, tracings are made from it for the workmen who are to cut the glass. The tracing is laid on the table, and the sheet of glass put over it; after which the workman follows the lines of the tracing with his diamond. In the case of darker colours, where the traced lines could not be seen through the glass, another method is followed. The piece of coloured glass is pounced with a bag of whiting, and laid under the tracing. The lines are then marked through, and show on the white substance. Simple as this process seems, it is a modern improvement on the practice of the ancients. The use of the diamond in cutting glass was not known till the sixteenth century, and the earlier method was much more complicated. The glass-maker had to draw a line on the glass with a point of tempered steel, so as to make a mark, and then to the other side of the glass he applied a hot iron called the dividing rod, the heat of which caused a crack along the line of the incision, which was moistened slightly if the glass was hard. He then took a small mallet of hard wood, and tapped on the glass till it separated, and any asperities were removed by filing.

The pieces of coloured glass thus cut out, and forming in their shapes the principal outlines of the picture, are either potmetal or coated glass. Potmetal glass is so called from its being coloured with oxides of metals fused with it in the furnace, *verre teint dans la masse*.† It is to this glass that Mr. Winston alludes when he says that colour applied to glass with a brush cannot possibly be so brilliant as colour made in the glass-house. Although blue potmetal glass, he adds, is nothing more than white glass mixed with cobalt and fused, and the enamel blue applicable to glass consists of soft white glass mixed with cobalt and fused upon the glass, yet the greater and longer continued heat of the glass-house, as compared with that of the glass-painter's kiln, causes a more thorough admixture of the vitreous

* Labarte. M. Bontemps says, 'L'indication des couleurs sur le 'carton suffit pour que le peintre verrier puisse exécuter son vitrail.'

† Lasteyrie, 'Quelques Mots sur la Théorie de la Peinture sur 'Verre.'

with the colouring particles, and therefore gives rise to greater transparency, greater brilliancy and power. *Cotti al fuoco, e non messi a olio* is the stipulation about colours for glass, contained in one of Mrs. Merrifield's 'Original Treatises.' M. Bontemps gives an account of the potmetal and coated glasses which were at the command of the glass-painter in the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. There was the ruby (*le beau rouge*, he calls it) coloured by the protoxide of copper and the oxide of iron; blue, which was coloured by a preparation of cobalt;* two hues of violet, coloured by what was then called magnesia, but is now the oxide of manganese; yellow, coloured by an excessive use of carbon in preparing the glass; and two hues of green, coloured by the deutoxide of copper and the oxide of iron. Some writers have stated that the blue glass was coloured with lapis lazuli, but the incorrectness of this view was shown by the analysis of ancient glass made at Mr. Winston's suggestion.

'I was anxious in the autumn of 1849,' Mr. Winston writes, 'to procure some blue glass like that of the twelfth century; that is to say, not a raw positive blue, such as we see in modern windows, but a soft bright intense blue, or rather, a sort of neutralised purple, and for this purpose I submitted some twelfth century blue glass to Mr. Medlock for analysis.'

Mr. Medlock's analysis showed that the colouring matter was cobalt, and Mr. Winston's blue glass for the Temple windows was made on that principle.

'The merit of the discovery,' he says, 'is to be ascribed to the chemical science of my friend Mr. Medlock, of the Royal College of Chemistry, and the practical skill of Mr. Edward Green, of Messrs. Powell's Glass Works, in Whitefriars.'

Coated glass, which the French call *doublé*, and the most striking specimen of which is the ruby, is merely white glass covered on one side with a layer of potmetal. The reason for this in the case of ruby is that its colouring is so intense that it would seem opaque if formed into a sheet of ordinary thickness. The ruby glass made before the fifteenth century was very thick, and when examined through a microscope it looked as if it was filled with an infinite number of the thinnest possible parallel laminæ of colour, which to the naked eye presented a stratified appearance. The art of making ruby lay dormant for more than a century, and was revived by M. Bontemps in 1826. Mr. Winston quotes a curious passage from Evelyn

* This preparation, says M. Bontemps, was called *saffre*, which led many writers to confuse it with sapphire, and to talk of the extreme liberality of the Abbé Suger.

on the difficulty of finding a red stain that would penetrate into the glass, and partake of its transparency.

'At the meeting of the Royal Society, were exhibited some pieces of amber sent by the Duke of Brandenburg, in one of which was a spider, in another a gnat, both very entire. There was a discourse of the tingeing of glass, especially with red, and the difficulty of finding any red colour effectual to penetrate glass, among the glass-painters; that the most diaphanous, as blue, yellow, &c., did not enter into the substance of what was ordinarily painted, more than very shallow, unless incorporated in the metal itself, other reds and whites not at all beyond the superficies.'

The ruby is by far the most powerful colour, and it admits of very beautiful variations. Such a variation is streaky ruby, often used for large masses of drapery. Another variation is mentioned in the 'Hints on Glass-Painting,' namely, spots of melted ruby sprinkled on white glass while on the blowpipe, so as to represent blood-stains on the hand and wrist of the Saviour.

We have thus got a coloured mosaic corresponding in its lines to the outlines of the cartoon, and in its broad effects of colour to the finished effects of the painting. With the grand deep hues of the ancient glass, such a mosaic *formait déjà une riche décoration*, and the further steps taken then were extremely simple. The early painter had only to mark in the shadows with a brownish wash, and to lay on a few strokes of the same for the hands and faces. But now a greater finish is often imparted to the faces, and, to avoid minuteness of leading, larger pieces of glass are taken for broken lights and shadows, and are painted upon afterwards, even by those who profess to follow the mosaic method.* They admit however that only one colour is to be considered legitimate, the enamel brown, of which several shades are employed. And this enamel brown, like all other enamel colours, consists of colouring matter mixed with pulverised glass which is called a flux, and which, melting sooner than the colour, enables the colour to adhere firmly to the surface of the glass. The Munich artists use besides a gray colour, got by employing manganese instead of simply the oxide of iron, and 'the occasional use of an enamel of a dif-'ferent colour from brown for shading' is mentioned by Mr.

* 'Some glass-painters,' says Mr. C. H. Wilson, 'break the glass 'into bits merely to lead it up again, because old glass is in bits. 'This is another unworthy trick.' We quite agree with him. There is surely no need of multiplying difficulties in such an art as glass-painting, or of sacrificing the effects that might be attained in order to have a chance of other effects which are no longer attainable.

Winston as the only modern improvement on the mosaic system of which he is aware.

But besides the enamel brown, the glass-painter has a powerful auxiliary in the shape of the yellow stain, which is laid on at the back of the glass, and penetrates the glass to some little depth. It is also as transparent as the glass itself, forming in this respect a contrast to enamel colours, which must be more or less opaque, and which only adhere to the surface. The stain is 'floated on,' that is, applied in a mass, instead of being laid on by successive touches. By its aid the painter can modify other colours of mosaic glass, turning blue glass to green. The chief ingredient of the yellow stain is silver, but when floated on before burning it is united with a reddish substance which gives it the appearance of a layer of red chalk on the back of the glass. This is brushed off after burning when the stain has penetrated. The use of the stain was discovered by one of those happy accidents which seem to recur in the history of all mechanical devices, and which are so often the mere anticipation of what would have been discovered sooner or later, the timely surrender of what would have been conquered.

'Levieil gives the following account of it. Fra Giacomo being one day occupied in placing his glass in the furnace, in order to fix the colours, let fall a silver button from his sleeve without perceiving it. The button sank into the lime, which is always placed in the furnace under the glass. The furnace being closed, the enamels melted. The button, or at least a part of it, was fused, and it imparted a yellow stain to the glass which lay above it, and this yellow stain was found to have penetrated into the substance of the glass.' (*Mrs. Merrifield's Original Treatises.*)

The separate pieces of glass are now taken to the furnace to be burnt or fired. They are laid on shelves of earthenware or cast iron, which are covered with a layer of Spanish chalk mixed with water, so that the glass may not adhere to it. Any inequalities in the chalk would give their shape to the glass, so that smoothness is essential. The box containing these shelves is called a muffle, and is placed in the upper compartment of the furnace. The furnace is heated with coke or charcoal, and the fire made to burn up slowly, so that the muffle may acquire an even degree of temperature throughout. After the first burning the separate pieces of glass are often set upon a glass easel, fastened to it by wax, and retouched before a second burning. Of course any touches that are added after the final burning are worse than useless. Mr. Winston condemns that practice most emphatically in a letter to Mr. C. H. Wilson :—

'The practice to which you allude, of *touching up* painted windows after they are leaded up, with a colour which is not fixed to the glass by burning, and which must fall off as soon as the vehicle with which it is mixed loses its tenacity, as it must be expected to do within a few years, is one unfortunately too common in this country. . . . Mr. —— touched up his three east windows in our church here with common oil-paint, to give them solidity, which peeled off in places in five or six years, and last year it was so bad that the windows were this autumn painted over again at the back. I think they look worse than they did; but in two or three years they will be uniform in appearance, owing to the peeling off of the paint.'

Nothing now remains but the leading, the characteristic 'note' of glass-painting, the chief obstacle against which the artist has to contend, and the means by which the early painters produced some of their finest effects. The leading is equally indispensable for enamel as for mosaic paintings; and, as Mr. Winston observes, the largest sheets of painted glass ever made were small in comparison with the opening of an ordinary window, while their size rendered it impossible for them to be burnt so as to vitrify the enamel. There may be more or less skill displayed in managing the leadwork, but it is an integral part of each painted window. Mr. Oliphant gives the old artists credit for frankly admitting its necessity and using the strong black lines so as to heighten the effect of their paintings. Mr. Waring says that the dark lines are lost in the distance, but give greater solidity to the whole work, and increased contrast and distinctness to the separate colours. The mode of applying the leadwork is as follows. The tracing of the outlines is laid on a table, and each separate piece of glass is fitted into its place. As each piece is put in order, it is fastened temporarily by a nail driven into the table against the edge of the glass, and when the lead line has been bent round the glass, the nail is driven in again outside the lead. The leading is smooth on two sides, and has on the other two sides a groove or channel into which the pieces of glass are fitted. It bends easily to the grooved sides, but is stiff towards the smooth ones. The joints of the lead are soldered, and cement is rubbed in between the glass and the lead so as to fill up the interstices. After this the window may be made fast to the saddle-bars or arming, an iron framework which supports the whole window, and is let into the stonework.

Readers who have followed the various steps of this description will see that there are mechanical impediments at every turn. It is true that modern workers in glass are very skilful, but does not this expose the artist to the dangers of conven-

tionality? Every new design, every artistic modification of existing methods, may be set aside as interfering with the old routine. It is the same in all kinds of work where much has to be left to subordinates, and where the actual master can at best exercise a general supervision. This fact, coupled with Mr. Winston's experience that many glass-painters do not know good glass from bad, and encourage the making of bad glass as much cheaper, might almost lead us to despair of the future of glass-painting. It must, we fear, lead us to the conclusion that glass-painting will have to be mastered as a science before it can succeed as an art, and that there must be a profound comprehension of the great works of earlier times before we can hope to rival them in design or execution.

It cannot be said indeed that the moderns are indifferent on the subject of painted glass, or that they are willing to leave its merits to be decided by posterity. But while we are uncertain on a great many points, we all have our favourite theories, and without knowing exactly what we want, we are not willing to surrender anything that we have claimed. The broad principles of painted glass naturally supply a large field for controversy, but the strife is waged with equal persistency when the minor details are brought into consideration. Critics may affect to smile at arguments which answer to the familiar definition of metaphysics, as neither party understands what he is talking about, but these disputes have really a very serious meaning. With the number of churches that are yearly built, rebuilt, restored, or embellished, orders are being constantly given for painted glass to different firms and different countries. We have no statistics to show how many windows are put up in the course of the year, but let anyone think how many have been added lately to his neighbourhood, how many styles are represented, how many battles have been fought. One school is devoted to ancient windows, and thinks modern glass-painters can do nothing but imitate the ancients. Another thinks the enamel paintings very beautiful, and is content to turn windows into pictures. Another has a sober taste for the old *grisaille*, relieved by occasional bits of deep rich colour. It is in truth a faithful reduction to smaller dimensions of the war that is waged among the writers on painted glass. Mr. Winston wishes glass-painting to take its place among the high arts, while others would degrade it to the rank of a manufacture. And though all the authorities from whom we have quoted agree in limiting the range of painted glass, and dwelling on its inadequacy to cope with other methods, Mr. Oliphant remarks grandly, 'we paint not upon an unfeatured canvass, but upon the light 'itself.'

The system on which painted windows are added to our modern churches is more favourable to the growth of these dissensions than to a lasting settlement of the question. It is a system that leaves too much to individualism, and contributes powerfully to the growth of that false spirit of liberty from which the freest countries are most apt to suffer. We mean the spirit of encouraging private liberty in things that concern the public, and bringing public opinion to bear on things that concern private persons. It is not our object to dwell on the most prominent manifestations of this spirit, but merely to show how it bears on this branch of our subject. When several persons unite in decorating one building, it is surely essential that there should be agreement and harmony. This point was not unnoticed by the Glasgow Committee. The fifty-nine subscribers who put up the forty-eight windows agreed to unite in the adoption of a general plan. In his correspondence with these subscribers the Secretary did not meet with one difficulty. 'Only two subjects,' he writes, 'were not chosen 'by me; one was an improvement upon mine, the other was 'not, but was very good. If I made objection to any subject 'as not suited to the conditions of glass-painting, or to our 'general scheme, I was instantly listened to. The case is 'without a parallel.' Here we are well pleased to agree with Mr. Wilson. In most churches, when it occurs to some one that a painted window would be a fitting memorial of a parent or dear friend, how seldom does he consider the situation of the window, the character of the adjoining or opposite windows, and the effect required to heighten the general beauty of the building. Instead of bestowing a thought on this, he goes to the glass-painter who has put up some pretty windows in another church, or who happens to advertise in the paper which circulates in the neighbourhood, or who has lately been extolled by some artistic oracle. Hence we find light windows exposed to the full rays of the sun, and dark glass obscuring what little light there was already under the shadow of the pulpit. If a church was intended to form an exhibition of the comparative merits of glass-painters, there might be some excuse for the way in which Belgian enamels are placed by the side of English mosaics, and Newcastle is allowed to vie with Birmingham. But even if this *mélange* was suited to the character of the building, there would be a further objection to it; the want of harmony must be prejudicial to the contrasted windows; the dark glass will seem opaque because the light glasses admit a glare, and because the sun pours through them in such floods as to light the opposite

windows from within, with reflected instead of transmitted radiance.

To some extent these faults exist in the new windows at Lincoln. They certainly exist in those of the new church at Doncaster. There we have a large east window by Hardman, seven windows by Wailes, two by Ward and Hughes, one by Clayton and Bell, and two by Capronier of Brussels.* Among all these different styles it is easy to lose sight of the guiding principles of glass-painting. We are tempted to compare one window with another, instead of judging them all by an impartial standard. We are apt to observe how one man avoids the faults of another, and we forget that both may have fallen into some more grievous error. Where we have ancient glass as a check on the modern, we are more quick to observe the failings of the new, but we expect it to rival the merits of the old. Unfortunately some of our glass-painters attempt this by a close imitation of those peculiarities which are in keeping with the tone of early glass, but seem ludicrous on the bright new surface. Mr. Hardman's east window, at Doncaster, is rich and harmonious, but the figures are wilfully mediæval. Mr. Winston has a pointed censure on this practice, and blames the habit of representing the Passage of the Red Sea by 'a capering figure between two cauliflowers;' the Plagues of Egypt by 'carcases of frogs and fish sprawling in a plate;' and the Raising of Lazarus by 'a mummy jumping up like 'Jack in the box.' In the Doncaster window, we noticed particularly a figure of an angel bending over our Lord; the angel is an exaggeration of the long figures of the early painters, and the bend of the upper part of the body makes it three times the length of life. The four windows by Mr. Wailes, in the Forman Chapel, are very good; the lower part of the east window especially. But Mr. Wailes is the most unequal of glass-painters; and while some of his windows merit high praise, there are others very far below the average. The window by Messrs. Ward and Hughes, put up by Sir Isaac Morley to the memory of his father, is more graceful in its figures than the windows near it, and shows great breadth and freedom. But it is in some degree open to the charge which may be brought against many recent works

* It is impossible to give more than a list of the chief modern glass-painters, as their works are so scattered, and their best ones could only be ascertained by making the round of England. Mr. Apsley Pellatt's report on the Exhibition of 1862 mentions favourably Messrs. Clayton and Bell, Ward and Hughes, Powell, Lavers and Barraud, Preedy, and Heaton, Butler and Bayne.

of the same artists, that it is too pictorial. The sheep in the foreground contrast advantageously with those in the next window which (as the old verger took pleasure in remarking) were like curly-haired pigs. But Messrs. Ward and Hughes are too apt to stipple, and their sheep, though natural, were too finished for glass.

The two west windows by Capronier of Brussels are even darker than Munich windows, while they show the same minuteness of handling. The old verger confessed that he liked them best when the church was lighted with gas, and they made very pretty pictures. In other respects he liked Wailes's windows best, as being 'most church like.' Perhaps if he could help others to a right understanding of that definition, he might do yet more service than he does in his present capacity.

At Lincoln, we have only to point to the old windows, and especially the rose of the north transept, which Mr. Winston extols as perfection. And yet what modern glass-painter can hope to reach that standard? Those two rose-windows which face each other, the one in its grand simplicity, the other with its artful involutions, gaze down upon modern efforts with the smile of unapproachable beauty. It is the southern rose, made up so evidently of fragments of glass, about which there runs the legend already communicated in these pages. 'At Lincoln 'Cathedral there is a beautiful painted window which was made 'by an apprentice out of the pieces of glass which had been 'refused by his master. It is so far superior to every other 'in the church, that according to the tradition, the van-'quished artist killed himself from mortification.' (*Ed. Rev.*, May, 1828.) We all remember the brilliant theory based on this tradition, and the memorial window of English History made out of the pieces of glass which had been refused by earlier writers, and which were collected with the most curious research from the moats where they had been buried,* pieced together with marvellous skill, and burnished till they gave out more than their ancient lustre. Yet the tradition yields to the touch of inquiry. There is a difference in date of at least a hundred years between the glass of the two rose-windows. The theory of them which needs no support in fact, is that they

* 'At Salisbury Cathedral,' says Mr. Winston, 'whole cartloads of glass, lead, and other rubbish were removed from the nave and transepts, and shot into the town ditch then in course of being filled up; whilst a good deal of similar rubbish was used to level the ground near the Chapter House.'

typify the two eyes of the Church, the Bishop and the Dean. According to the metrical Life of St. Hugh (quoted in Mr. King's Hand-book to the Eastern Cathedrals), 'the Bishop 'looked toward the South, the quarter of the Holy Spirit, as 'though inviting his influence; the Dean toward the North, the 'region of the devil, in order to watch his advances.'

We have seen how strongly symbolism prevails in the windows of Bourges Cathedral, and how much stress was laid by the French ecclesiastics on painted windows as a means of instruction for the laity. It is therefore noticeable that this same idea existed in Lincoln at so early a date, and has been introduced once more in the largest of the modern windows. The east window, by Messrs. Ward and Hughes, was planned by a former dean of Lincoln to illustrate the Atonement. With this view, the chief events in the life of our Lord are represented in round medallions forming a square cross. Within the angles of the cross are Old Testament subjects in quatrefoil medallions, and the figures of the prophets who predicted our Saviour's coming. The subjects are so arranged that types and antitypes are in close juxtaposition.

'The groups are executed on the principle of basrelief; the figures being cut out and insulated by the ground of the panel, and rendered rotund and distinct by powerful shadows. In imparting a blue tone to the window, the artists have been influenced by a desire to assist the long-drawn perspective of the choir, and to apparently throw back the east wall instead of bringing it forward by an opposite treatment.' (*Report of Lincoln Diocesan Architectural Society.*)

The window has that rather pale, light tone which gives an air of shallowness to so much modern glass, but it contrasts favourably with the other windows in the cathedral by the same artists.

The north side of the nave at Lincoln is monopolised by Messrs. Ward and Hughes, but on the south side we have perhaps the most remarkable specimen of the modern Lincoln glass, the Sutton windows. Two sons of the late Sir R. Sutton have devoted themselves to the art of glass-painting, have put up two windows to the memory of their father, and have filled up several other windows in the cathedral. 'Suis manibus 'vitriaverunt' is part of the inscription on the tablet underneath the two first windows in the nave; and to those acquainted with the difficulties of glass-painting, the three words will seem to convey no trifling boast. But to that boast the Suttons have the fullest right. They have mastered the whole process, and their labour has not been in vain.

Besides the large west window, and the four westernmost windows in the nave, there are some Sutton windows in the choir, and in one or two other parts of the church. One of these at least is made up of fragments of old glass, but the modern tone is not to be detected in any of the windows. The fine deep hues, both of blue and ruby, impress you at the first glance, while the general harmony is such that it is hard to tell what colours predominate. As a rule, perhaps, the rich colours prevail over the lighter ones, and the windows want some relief. But they were put up at a time when the nave was far too light, and Mr. George Gilbert Scott says they suit the architecture better than any of the other windows. The effect of the first from the west is kaleidoscopic from the number of small figures, while the fourth succeeds best in soberness and harmony. The window by Clayton and Bell, which follows close upon the Suttons, suffers by the comparison. But it is most unfortunate that the two succeeding windows by Hedgeland and Chance should have been admitted. Mr. Hedgeland's window is an imitation of classic bas-relief with flying draperies; Mr. Chance's seems to have been intended for a staircase, and to have had religious subjects let in by accident. The two remaining windows, one by Wailes, and the other by Preedy, are in all respects better; the silvery white of the Preedy is particularly pleasing, and the Wailes is a copy from Chartres. The only fault to be found with it is that the mixture of blue and red has produced an effect of lilac. In like manner, the window to the memory of Lord Yarborough, by Clayton and Bell, has an opaque pea-green tint, as if it was washed in green pea-soup. Wishing to relieve their window by green, and having used it largely, Messrs. Clayton and Bell refused to adopt the old blue of which the Suttons had made such a successful use, but substituted a greenish blue with the result that we have specified. Both artists have forgotten the warning of M. F. de Lasteyrie against the confusion of certain colours, and the instance he gives of the modification of one tint by another. 'Everyone,' he says, 'may remark that yellow employed largely and 'directly in the neighbourhood of blue, gives blue a greenish 'tinge, which entirely changes its value.' And he alludes to the French escutcheon which was put up at St. Denis, and in which, when the window was in its place, instead of gold *fleurs de lis* on a blue ground, the *fleurs de lis* became rose-coloured. 'Red close to blue,' he continues, 'causes a very raw violet, 'unless it is relieved by being picked out with some other 'colour. For this white is particularly suited.'

Among the modern windows that we have examined, a word must be given to the new east window in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, by Messrs. Clayton and Bell; and more than one word to the painted glass in the Temple, the firstfruits of Mr. Winston's labours. The windows on the south side of the round church are made of 'Winston's glass,' and were painted under his direction by Messrs. Ward and Hughes. Those opposite are later, but are also by Messrs. Ward and Hughes, and preserve most of their usual characteristics. Perhaps the interest attaching to the southern windows arises chiefly from their value as experiments, and from the deep glow of their single colours. For windows placed so near to the eye, they are almost too massive in their simplicity. But we cannot scrutinise them coldly, or gauge them purely with regard to their merits. As we look upon them the thought of their originator rises to our mind. We remember the study he devoted to each branch of the subject before he could satisfy himself as to the course that ought to be pursued. We think of his exultation at the success of the chemical analysis of old glass, and at beating the French glassmakers hollow. And we muse on the active life cut short in the midst of all its schemes of use and beauty, though not before others had profited by its example, and had filled themselves with its suggestions.

To all who have not already made themselves acquainted with that life, and whose curiosity about painted glass has been stimulated, instead of being sated, by modern contributions to the art, we recommend the work placed at the head of these pages. But they must not forget that in the words of the Brussels MS. translated by Mrs. Merrifield, 'as for the colours, 'there are works which teach the manner of composing them, 'but practice and experience do a great deal.' Those two words reveal the great secret of Mr. Winston's success, and they also show us the conditions without which glass-painting, as an art, cannot be restored to its former perfection. There must be practice and experience among those who are to give the order as well as among those who are to execute it; the artists must think more about the theory, and the amateurs more about the reality. This will seem a reversal of the present system, but it is only an addition to the present state of knowledge. Without it, the practice of glass-painting must always be attended by peculiar difficulties. An uncultivated taste imposes too severe requirements. Those who have never studied the wonderful economy of creation think they could have saved the Creator from some absurdities. Yet it is fair that modern times should demand more than might have

satisfied the ancients, and that modern glass-painters should be called upon to work for their own age, not for the past or the future. That style only will succeed which avoids conspicuous blemishes while it attains conspicuous merits. It must not shock our religious sense on the one hand, nor our love of nature on the other. It must tread in the steps of the old masters, but it must not borrow their garments. And while a professed imitation of mediæval windows would attract antiquaries, and picture windows would please the lovers of novelty, the only works that can endure will be such as present both classes with something they can admire—works which answer all the requirements of sense, and taste, and colour, works which would gratify artists and instruct the people.*

* Before we dismiss this attractive subject, we would make a suggestion as to the methods by which the painted windows which adorn our churches, ancient and modern, may best be depicted on a paper surface. Photographs have lately been taken from the windows of Glasgow Cathedral, which afford some idea of the designs of the artists, but they want the essential conditions of colour and transparency. Photography is far better adapted to the reproduction of such works as M. de Triqueti's 'Marmor Homericum,' which has been finely executed by Mr. S. Thompson. But the invention of printing by coloured stones, or chromo-lithography, has now acquired in this country the perfection and the dignity of an art. When the Arundel Society commenced its series of publications, it was necessary to send them to be executed at Berlin. But the recent productions of the London colour-press are fully equal to those of any other country. We allude more especially to the beautiful illustrations of our tasteful contemporary 'Nature and Art,' and to the magnificent series of coloured works published by Messrs. Day and Son within the last few months. The brilliancy with which they imitate the richest colours of China and India or the illuminated manuscripts of the middle ages, equals that of the originals. Why should not the same skill be applied to the representation of the finest specimens of painted glass? A few illustrations are to be found in Mr. Winston's volume now before us; but the work might be carried to far greater perfection, and a collection of the best painted windows, in chromo-lithography, arranged with due regard to their historical and artistic character, would be a production of singular beauty and interest.

ART. VI.—1. *Report from the Select Committee on Tenure and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act, together with the Proceedings of the Committee and Minutes of Evidence.* Ordered to be printed by the House of Commons. June 23, 1865.

2. *Contributions to an Inquiry into the State of Ireland.* By the Right Hon. Lord DUFFERIN, K.P. London: 1866.

3. *Speech of the Earl of Kimberley on the Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance Bill.* 'The Times,' August 7, 1866.

4. *Land Tenure in Ireland: a Plea for the Celtic Race.* By ISAAC BUTT, formerly Professor of Political Economy in the University of Dublin. Dublin: 1866.

5. *Speech of Mr. Bright, M.P., at Dublin.* 'The Morning Star,' October 31, 1866.

THE threats and rumours of a treasonable outbreak, which during the last month have attracted so much attention to Ireland, happily seem unlikely to be followed by any overt act of insurrection. It is possible that the danger of actual rebellion may have been exaggerated. It is certain that the precautions taken by the Government would have prevented the success of the insurgents had a rising been attempted. So far we have reason to congratulate ourselves on Ireland being saved from the horrors of civil war, and on England being saved the disgrace of admitting before the world that after centuries of rule in Ireland, she still holds that country by the sword alone. The Government has doubtless done its duty in overawing rebellion by a timely display of physical force. But there are very grave duties for it still to perform. We have it on the authority of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer that 'there are grievances existing in Ireland which in any other country would be 'redressed by revolution,' and that 'they would be so redressed 'in Ireland if the overwhelming power of England did not 'prevent it.' Amongst the chief of these grievances are the Irish Established Church and the social relations existing between the owners and the occupiers of the soil.

The question of a reform in the relations between landlord and tenant is the one that, almost to the exclusion of every other political subject, absorbs the attention of the popular party in Ireland. Nor is it unnatural that this should be the case. To a statesman who recognises in the Established Church of Ireland the root from which have sprung almost all her social misfortunes—the land tenure system itself to a large

extent included—the removal of that obvious injustice may seem to be of primary importance. But to the tenant farmer, to the day labourer, to the village shopkeeper, to the Roman Catholic priest—to all those, in fact, who form what may be called the popular party, and who look on the daily diminution of the population as an unmixed evil caused in great measure by the insecurity of the occupier—the Land Question comes home most nearly as an object of political interest. In the popular treatment of this question the emigration of the people is generally represented as being compulsory rather than voluntary. The exile's doom has either been directly pronounced by the landlord, or has been indirectly caused by the stagnation of industry resulting from the absence of that stimulus to work which can be alone imparted by the certainty of a just remuneration. Whether or not the popular view is altogether accurate there is great room to doubt. It may not be obvious that the emigration movement from Ireland to America would be effected by any changes in legislation to the extent that is popularly anticipated. But while there exists a condition of the laws affecting the land which statesmen of all parties have at different times admitted to require reform, and to which the great majority of the nation attributes, whether rightly or wrongly, the absence of national prosperity, it is plain that a serious effort should be made to reform those laws. Such an effort the late Administration proposed to make, and we believe that they were sincere in their expressed desire to pass a Bill that would have the effect of setting this question at rest by securing to the Irish tenant, in case of eviction, full remuneration for all increase of value created by him on his landlord's property. The Bill proposed by Mr. Chichester Fortescue was founded in great measure on the same principles as that drawn up by the Committee of Irish Liberal members specially appointed to propose a specific settlement of the land question. That these principles were in some particulars more liberal to the tenant than might have been expected will be evident to those who followed at all closely the evidence, and who compared that evidence with the report of the Tenure and Improvement of Land Committee which sat at the close of the session of 1865. Six witnesses only were examined before that committee, but they were all called on behalf of the promoters of the tenant's cause. Their evidence, therefore, may reasonably be taken as a fair general exposition of the views of what is called the Tenant-right party. The six witnesses examined before that committee were:—1st, Lord Dufferin, the owner of extensive estates in Ulster, and a nobleman distinguished not more

by his ability than by the largeness and liberality of his views on the relations of landlord and tenant; 2nd, Judge Longfield, a distinguished political economist, and, from his extensive experience in the Incumbered Estates Court, well acquainted with the system of land tenure in Ireland; 3rd, Alderman J. B. Dillon, a gentleman who, although, like Judge Longfield, not an owner of land, had nevertheless given much attention to the subject of Irish land tenure, and who was, as a barrister, competent to give a valuable opinion as to legislative possibilities; 4th, Mr. M'Carthy Downing, a gentleman combining legal knowledge with experience in the management of property in the South; 5th, the Most Rev. Dr. Keane, a Roman Catholic bishop, who was specially chosen as a witness on account of his being notably versed in the popular ideas and theories of tenant-right; and, 6th, Mr. Curling, a successful and popular manager of property in Ireland, and a gentleman of large and varied experience of land management in other countries. As far as the investigation went there could hardly have been a selection of witnesses more qualified to put the tenant's case, as at present understood, plainly before Parliament. It may therefore be well to examine a little in detail those parts of their evidence tending to prove the present necessity for legislation, and giving suggestions as to the mode in which that legislation might be carried into effect.

One remarkable result of the lapse of time that has occurred is, that the demand for retrospective legislation which formed a part of several Bills first introduced and assented to by large majorities in the House of Commons, although it was one great stumbling-block in the way of settling the land question in 1852–3–4, was no longer urged before the Committee of 1865. The reason for this is not far to seek. Any tenant who ten years ago may have had a claim for improvements previously effected by him, has since then either had his claim annihilated by eviction, or perceptibly weakened by the enjoyment of an undisturbed occupancy of ten years. Again, the improvements made within those ten years by tenants-at-will are universally allowed to have been from various causes very few. Knowing the great difficulty that there would now be in inducing Parliament to undertake retrospective legislation on this subject, it is fortunate that this demand is no longer made a part of the tenant's case, and that the late conference of Irish Liberal members decided that a retrospective clause was not to form part of the Bill to be prepared by their committee. The chief object proposed to be gained by Mr. Maguire's Committee was the procuring evidence to aid Parliament in making such amendments

of the Act of 1860—commonly called Mr. Cardwell's Act—as would render it useful, instead of remaining as heretofore a legal dead letter. The conclusions arrived at by the committee were: 1st. In favour of maintaining the principle that compensation to tenants should only be secured upon improvements made with the consent of the landlord. 2nd. A recommendation that the payment of a lump sum should be substituted for the annuity provided by the Act of 1860. 3rd. That the duration of the compensating period should in certain cases be altered.

As regards the last of these suggestions the committee seemed to have no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion. Most of the evidence, but particularly that of Mr. Curling, which was eminently practical, and showed a full knowledge of his subject, went to the same object, namely, an extension of the period of compensation fixed in the Act of 1860, varying according to the kinds of improvement for which compensation was sought. The second recommendation, that the payment of a lump sum should be substituted for the annuity provided by Mr. Cardwell's Act, was also unanimously agreed to by the committee, all the evidence having been favourable to such a change. It was in fact only on certain points bearing on the first conclusion of the committee, that a remarkable discrepancy was to be found in the evidence of the various witnesses. The chief of these diversities of opinion arose as to whether or not a preliminary notice of intended improvement should in all cases be served upon the landlord. Mr. Dillon, Bishop Keane, and Mr. Downing all expressed a strong opinion that it was imperative to do away with the present obligation on the tenant-at-will to give formal notice to his landlord of intended improvement as a preliminary step towards acquiring a right to eventual compensation. Judge Longfield as strongly insisted on the absolute necessity of a previous written notice being served on the landlord. Lord Dufferin's scheme of arbitration by state-appointed valuators was founded entirely on a plan of which preliminary notice was an integral part. Mr. Curling considered preliminary notice essential, both as a matter of justice to the landlord and as a requisite means for ascertaining the date at which the compensating period should commence.

Another point on which a very remarkable difference of opinion presented itself was the question whether any length of enjoyment at the original rent should in justice be held to be sufficient compensation for a tenant's outlay by which the permanent value of a farm may have been increased. Judge

Longfield, more than once, but most distinctly perhaps in his answer to *Q.* 905, stated his opinion that no length of enjoyment, however profitable, was enough to do away with a tenant's claim to the repayment by the landlord of his money sunk in improving that landlord's property. On the other hand, several of his views expressed in answer to other questions bearing on this point, seemed scarcely compatible with such an opinion. For instance, in reply to *Q.* 620, he says he thinks, in justice to tenants who have either created or purchased improvements from other tenants on properties where the tenant-right custom has existed, that the Landed Estates Court should have power, previous to selling such properties, to give compensation to such tenants in the form of a twenty-one years' lease. Again (839), where he proposes to allow the landlord the alternative of offering a thirty-one years' lease at the old rent after termination of a tenancy, instead of paying cash to the tenant for improvements made by him during that period—thus seeming to admit that a certain secured tenure may be a fair set-off against certain outlay.

Bishop Keane spoke still more strongly on this point. He held that view to be altogether fallacious which regards landlord and tenant as co-partners—one furnishing the raw material, the other the labour. He went so far as to say that even after an enjoyment of sixty-one years under a lease, a tenant should have a right to claim the full value of the unexhausted improvements made by him during his lease, even where it could be demonstrated that he had been more than repaid principal and interest during his occupancy. Mr. Downing's evidence went in the same direction and nearly to the same length. Mr. Dillon held (1861) that the strict right of a landlord, in the absence of any covenant, is to get his land back exactly as he gave it to the tenant. His view, therefore, if closely adhered to, would lead to the same conclusions arrived at by Bishop Keane. But Mr. Dillon modified his claim on the tenant's behalf by limiting it to the actual amount spent, even though the value created thereby might have exceeded that amount. Lord Dufferin's opinion coincided with the one generally held, namely, that proportionate tenures should be considered a sufficient compensation for certain outlay. In his reply to *Q.* 1071 he gave a lengthened statement of his reasons for holding this opinion, and endeavoured to prove that the contrary one would lead to a general raising of rents, from giving to capital invested in land improvement a higher rate of interest than that to be derived from other investments, and thus creating or fostering undue competition. Mr. Curling (3962) expressed his 'dissent *in toto* from

'those who would exclude duration of occupancy in considering 'the compensation to be awarded to a tenant for improvements,' which he characterised as 'a desire to convert a proprietor in 'fee-simple into a lord of copyhold manor.' He further expressed his concurrence in Lord Dufferin's opinion that the utmost a tenant can fairly claim is a duration of beneficial occupancy sufficient to compensate him for his original outlay with compound interest at 5 per cent., or proportionate payment if evicted in the meantime. Finally, he held that any additional rental value incidental to such improvements may justly be considered as the contribution of the landlord in the latent capabilities of the soil in the partnership which has existed between them.

Another important subject, on which considerable discussion arose, was the advisability of the Legislature taking steps to encourage the giving of leases. All the witnesses, with one exception, distinctly objected to the law interfering so far as to *force* landlords to give leases. That one exception was Judge Longfield, who (616) 'would be inclined to presume a tenancy 'for twenty-one years where there was not a written contract 'to the contrary.'*

Lord Dufferin expressed himself as favourable to short agricultural leases in individual instances. Mr. Curling proposed to encourage the practice of granting leases as compensation, and to extend the leasing powers of limited owners. Mr. Downing was not only favourable to leases of lives and thirty-one years for the future, but stated (2952) that even in the case of existing leases tenants should have the power to erect buildings and make other expenditure without the landlord's consent,† and to enforce a claim for compensation for same at the termination of their tenure. Bishop Keane and Mr. Dillon alike declined to interfere with existing contracts, but each proposed various schemes which in his opinion would have the effect of inducing landlords to give leases. Of these the chief were—1st. That the power of distress should be taken away except in cases of tenancy by lease. 2nd. That the county cess, now paid exclusively by the occupier, should be made payable in all tenancies not by lease by owner and occupier in

* This idea has lately been again put forward in a Bill drawn up by Sir Colman O'Loghlin, and introduced to the notice of Parliament by him and Mr. Gregory.

† It is obvious that in cases of tenure by lease, the phrase,' without 'the landlord's consent,' may include cases where there has been an expressed dissent.

equal proportions, like the Irish poor-rate. 3rd. That in cases of 'long' leases, it should be compulsory on the tenant to give preliminary notice of intended improvements, in order to establish a claim to compensation. 4th. That in all tenures of less than thirty-one years a condition shall be implied that a tenant, if evicted, shall be entitled to compensation for all improvements made by him during his tenancy. 5th. That the offer of a thirty-one years' lease, at present rent, shall be deemed a set-off against all previous improvements made by the tenant. The above points, on which we have endeavoured to epitomise the evidence given, were those most nearly affecting the possibility of legislating on this extremely difficult question. No doubt in some most important particulars the evidence was very conflicting, and the difficulty of bringing these diverging opinions into accord is the greater when it is observed that, in the first place, they arose on questions to some extent affecting the abstract rights of property—and, in the next, that the exponents of what may be called the popular view were at direct issue upon these very points with Lord Dufferin and Mr. Curling—representatives of the proprietary interest specially chosen as witnesses from the fact of their known views on the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland being unusually liberal.

Since the date at which the Tenure and Improvement of Land Committee reported, there have been published various opinions and suggestions with regard to the land question. Some of these discuss in particular those points on which, as we have seen, the representatives of the proprietary and the occupying classes were at variance. Some, like Mr. Bright in his late speech at Dublin, have introduced fresh, if not altogether relevant matter into the discussion. Some again, and at the head of the list stands Mr. Butt's 'Plea for the Celtic Race,' advocate a much more revolutionary solution of the difficulty than any hinted at before Mr. Maguire's Committee, or at any meeting of the National Association of Ireland. For the present we shall confine our remarks to the former class, and of these we have met with none where the subject is treated in a more practical manner than in Lord Dufferin's 'Contri-'butions to an Inquiry into the State of Ireland.' In that volume are reprinted two speeches delivered by Lord Dufferin, one in the House of Lords and the other at a tenants' dinner, both entering at some length into the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland. There is also a reproduction of his evidence before the Tenure and Improvement of Land Committee already alluded to. But, perhaps, the most interesting portion

of the whole volume is the 'correspondence between the re-'presentatives of a tenant and Lord Dufferin' on a disputed claim to compensation for improvements.

Lord Dufferin, in the short preface to the correspondence, states as his reason for publishing it, 'that it will afford a 'practical explanation of the landlord and tenant controversy,' as 'by the study of the opinions and arguments used by 'Messrs. Anderson and Dickson—both gentlemen of high 'character and position—a correct notion may be obtained of 'the point of view from which the more moderate champions 'of the interests of the tenant regard the respective rights of 'tenant and landlord.'

As by mutual consent the claim for compensation on account of improvements was to be referred to arbitration, it became necessary that the principles on which that valuation was to be made should be agreed upon by both parties previous to the appointment of an arbitrator. By Lord Dufferin's directions a memorandum, setting forth those principles and applying them in detail to the various kinds of improvements, was prepared by his agent Mr. Thomson, and was submitted to Messrs. Anderson and Dickson for approval and signature. This memorandum, which is given in full in Lord Dufferin's pamphlet, professes to be founded 'on the same principle as 'that assumed in the Devon Commission.' It will be enough here to state that in the case of all houses and farm-buildings, the calculation was based on the supposition that they had been built on the security of a seventy years' lease, and in the case of agricultural improvements, that they had been executed on that of a twenty-one years' lease. Consequently the arbitrator would have to convert the present value of the buildings into a seventy years' annuity at 5 per cent. calculated from the date of their erection. Thus the tenant's claim for buildings would be the present value of said annuity for the unexhausted term of the seventy years. The scale proposed for agricultural improvements varied according to the class of work executed.

While agreeing to the terms proposed in the case of buildings, the representatives of the tenant denied their justice as applied to agricultural improvements:—

'With regard' (they say in replying to Mr. Thomson's communication) 'to the unexhausted improvements on the farm, we take the liberty of saying that suitable fences in good keeping made more than twenty-one years ago, are not only as good, but better now than when constructed; that places converted into arable land, where once there were only rocks and marshes, are as valuable now as the

year after the rocks were removed or the marshes filled up. The same views we hold in some measure respecting drainage, if properly done ; its efficacy is not exhausted in twice fourteen years.

'We respectfully submit to your Lordship that it is fair and equitable to leave to the arbitrator to determine what is the present value of these improvements, be it much or be it little.'

In reply to this letter, Mr. Thomson, on the part of Lord Dufferin, argues at some length in opposition to the principle asserted by Messrs. Anderson and Dickson.

He then professes to show how unequally their principle would affect different tenants:—

'You say,' he writes, 'that the tenant is to receive compensation in accordance with the value of the improvements, by which I conclude you mean in accordance with the increased productive power of the land. Apply this principle to two farms, one containing wet heavy land, the other consisting of a light drier soil. Both the occupants drain their respective farms, we will suppose at a cost of 6*l.* an acre; but though the amount of capital sunk by each tenant has been identical, it is obvious that the benefit derived by the wet land may be greater than that obtained on the drier soil. In one case the return will be perhaps 12 per cent. only; in the other it may be 15 or 20. Yet at the expiration of their respective tenancies, although the capital expended by each has been the same, you would award the greater amount of compensation to the man who had received the largest amount of profit.'

Mr. Thomson then points out 'that although the capital 'of the tenant may be the means of calling into activity the 'inert properties of the soil, it does not (except in certain 'exceptional cases) "*create*" them, as is sometimes stated.' He concludes by pointing out that the principle of compensation by enjoyment is recognised by all European political economists, by the ancient Roman law; * that it is the principle desiderated by Mr. Pusey's Parliamentary Committee on Tenant Right, and recommended by the Devon Commission; and, finally, that Lord Dufferin cannot sanction a different one.

The next letter in the correspondence is one from Lord Dufferin, adverting to a point not before alluded to—viz., the rate of interest which in the above calculation is to be held as remunerative. He argues that, if a tenant on his own

* The Roman law, which is the foundation of the agricultural law of Europe, declared 'that when the tenants had derived profit 'from the improvements (*meliorationes*) sufficient to cover the prin- 'cipal sum, and interest of the money laid out upon them, no com- 'position was to be held due.'

responsibility has chosen to spend 100*l.* on an operation which only makes a return to him at the rate of 1, or 2, or 3 per cent., he should have the right of selling the annuity thus derived; but he has no right to lock up another man's money in so unprofitable an investment. After quoting various authorities as to what a fair rate would be, Lord Dufferin strikes a balance and concludes in his own case to consent to the adoption of a rate of interest that shall not be less than 5 nor more than 7½ per cent.

In answering these communications, Messrs. Anderson and Dickson define unexhausted improvements as 'those which 'the lapse of time has not exhausted from the soil, or reduced 'the value thereof to nothing: so long as they add anything 'to the letting value of the land, or the productive qualities of 'the soil, they are not exhausted and merit compensation to 'the amount of the benefit they are still contributing.' They then draw a marked distinction—and this is especially interesting to those applying this discussion to the South and West of Ireland—between the case of an ordinary twenty-one years' tenure entered on *without purchase*, and with the knowledge that at its close there is to be no right recognised to compensation for improvements, and the case of a tenure acquired by purchase or inheritance where the tenant-right custom of Ulster is in force. In the former case they say, 'a tenant will make no improvements but such as will 'repay him during his period of tenure.' In the other they view the tenant as purchasing or inheriting the improvements from his predecessors in the farm, and proceeding to make additional improvements on the faith of the Ulster tenant-right custom, which has existed for generations in the North of Ireland.

We have thought it worth while to quote at some length from this correspondence of Lord Dufferin, because the principle most prominently discussed in it is that on which the possibility of settling the land question by legislative means must in great measure depend. So far we have abstained from expressing any opinions of our own, and have merely stated those of various thinkers and writers on the question. We cannot, however, pass to another branch of the subject without making a few remarks on a point the right understanding of which is of such vital importance to the solution of the knottiest of Irish social problems. And here we would wish to be understood as acquiescing in the distinction drawn by Lord Dufferin's correspondent between those parts of Ireland where the tenant-right custom of Ulster has been

already in operation and the other provinces where this has not been the case. An incoming tenant who, with the knowledge of his landlord, has purchased from the outgoer the right of entry into a farm held at will, is obviously in a different position from that of a tenant who has entered a farm without purchase. The former, although he may not have spent a farthing in any kind of improvement during his individual tenancy, has invested, with his landlord's knowledge, a sum that is supposed to represent the value of improvements created by his predecessor.* The latter has simply covenanted to pay so much each year for the right of acquiring whatever profits his farm will produce under a fair course of husbandry over and above the rent he has engaged to pay. If it be obvious that the former, even without having improved, has a just claim to remuneration in case of being unexpectedly dispossessed, it seems equally obvious that the justice of any similar claim put forward by the latter is, to say the least, very doubtful. The following observations, therefore, are to be taken as applying only to those parts of Ireland where the tenant-right custom of Ulster has not hitherto been recognised.

The first difficulty against which those have to contend who maintain the abstract proposition, that 'no amount of repay-'ment obtained by length of occupancy can justly be held to 'be a set-off against the value of tenants' improvements unex-

* We are aware that there is considerable difference of opinion as to the real origin of the tenant-right of Ulster. Mr. Sharman Crawford, a high authority on that subject, says in a letter to Serjeant Shee written in 1853, 'I am of opinion that the custom 'was derived from the titles to lands under the Ulster plantation 'grants, which were based on the principle of reclaiming and im-'proving the soil, and for that special purpose only; that this 'custom was a substitute for fixed and certain tenures, which the 'landlords were bound to give, but which they evaded giving, and 'that this *quasi* perpetual interest, subject to a fairly valued rent, is 'what is sold under the name of "goodwill."' Lord Dufferin seems to hold a somewhat different opinion as to the origin of the Ulster custom. 'At the time of the plantations of Ulster and long 'after, it was the object of the landlords to attract tenants; conse-'quently tenants never thought of paying a bonus, in addition to 'the rent, for the farms they got. But increase of population pro-'duced competition; as the landlords still refrained from exacting 'a rack-rent, which is the inevitable product of competition, that 'product took another shape, and became the lump sum paid down 'under the name of goodwill by the incoming to the outgoing 'tenant. Hence the custom, so far as it does not refer to improve-'ments.' (*Evidence before Committee of* 1865.)

'hausted at the close of the tenancy,' is, that the universal practice is opposed to their view. We have already quoted the doctrine of the ancient Roman law on this point, which limits the tenant's claim to 'sufficient profits to cover the 'principal sum, with interest.' The 'Committee to inquire 'into the Agricultural Customs of England and Wales in 'respect to Tenant Right'—commonly known as 'Mr. Pusey's 'Committee'—which sat in 1848, published a report, in which the same principle is affirmed. That report (which, with the evidence on which it was founded, we recommend to the attention of all persons interested in the land question,) states, 'that 'different usages have long prevailed in different countries and 'districts conferring a claim to remuneration on an outgoing 'agricultural tenant for various operations of husbandry, the 'ordinary return of which he is precluded from receiving by 'the termination of his tenancy; that this claim, which is 'called tenant-right, extends (amongst others) to the purchase 'of food for stock, the purchase of certain kinds of manures, 'and the *draining, chalking, and marling of the soil*, outlays 'the result of which is to effect an improvement of the soil 'requiring more or less time to elapse before the increased 'productiveness thereby obtained reimburses the expenditure 'incurred.' That the amount of the compensation to which the tenant is justly entitled 'is found by valuers, who ascertain 'the cost of the several improvements, spread that cost over a 'certain number of years within which each kind of improvement respectively is supposed to repay itself, and then deduct 'from that number the time during which the tenant has enjoyed the benefit of the improvement.' Of the fifty-one witnesses who gave evidence before that committee—almost all of them tenant farmers specially chosen to represent the opinions of their class—not one, so far as we remember, even hinted at there being any injustice in such a principle. Their great desire, in fact, was that the customs which, as already stated, existed in certain counties, and of which this principle formed a part, should be universally recognised and enforced by law. In Mr. Napier's Act (1852), and in the very clause particularly pointed out by Mr. Butt in one of the works prefixed to this article, in order to defend his own proposition, to which we shall refer hereafter, from the charge of being revolutionary, the same principle is affirmed. This clause — the 26th of Mr. Napier's Act, which is generally known as the retrospective clause — provided that 'if any 'tenant . . . shall before the passing of this Act have executed' (such) 'improvements . . . and if the landlord . . . at any time

'before the expiration of a number of years to be computed 'from the date of the completion of such improvements, and 'corresponding with the compensating periods hereinbefore 'provided in respect of similar improvements to be made after 'the passing of this Act, shall proceed by law . . . and shall 'evict his interest in any holding on which such improvements 'shall have been made, otherwise than for non-payment of rent, '&c., &c.,' he shall be entitled to proportionate compensation. Again, in the Bill of Serjeant Shee, brought before Parliament in 1853, which was admitted by Mr. Sharman Crawford 'to 'comprise all the points of his (Mr. Crawford's) Bill in an 'amended form,' it was proposed that it should be lawful for the tenant to recover from his landlord a just and reasonable compensation for improvements made by the tenants, according to their actual value, 'after making all proper deductions and 'allowances, having due regard to the length of enjoyment of 'such improvements, &c.'

The custom existing in those parts of Scotland where the waste moorlands or mountain bases are being gradually brought into cultivation under twenty-one years' improving leases is founded on the same principle. The usual agreement is somewhat to the following effect. The tenant binds himself to do within a fixed time—say seven years—certain works of reclamation, such as removing boulders, making boundary fences, draining where necessary, subsoiling, liming, &c., under the directions and subject to the approval of the landlord or his factor. During these seven years his rent is merely a nominal one. During the succeeding seven years the land is supposed to have attained a greatly increased degree of fertility, and to be repaying the outlay incurred in its reclamation along with the yearly cost of working it. The rent is then raised to a sum previously agreed on—which may be treble the original rent, and yet perhaps not more than half the present actual value. At this rent, in some instances—in others at a rent to be again increased at the end of the next seven years—the farm is held until the close of the lease, when the land in its improved condition reverts to the owner.* Neither is this mode

* Mr. Curling, who is certainly no mean authority on such a subject, stated in his evidence before Mr. Maguire's Committee, that he considered a tenure of forty years the least under which a tenant's outlay with interest would be repaid in the case of dry mountain land, and that the tenure should be extended to sixty years in the case of wet mountain. We do not at all wish to express any opinion contrary to his views; we merely note the facts as they exist, to prove that the principle of compensation by enjoyment is in practice

of dealing by any means unknown in Ireland. On many Irish estates similar arrangements are made between the owners of waste lands and tenants having small farms adjoining, and no difficulty whatever arises in arranging a *prospective* bargain on the principle of compensation by enjoyment. It would seem evident, then, that no amount of abstract argument, however cleverly supported, will be likely to convince Parliament that a principle to which Irish tenants themselves, in common with all the rest of the world, are in practice perfectly willing to assent when making a bargain as to the future, must necessarily be unjust when applied to the past, or to cases where no specific bargain has been made. Moreover, to eliminate this principle from any Bill purporting to settle the land question would be a direct discouragement, if not an absolute prohibition, to the giving of leases, which it is one of the most desired objects of the late Government Bill to encourage. A landlord in giving a lease temporarily relinquishes certain rights—that, for example, of cultivating his own land himself, and receiving the occupier's as well as the owner's profit; that of investing his own capital in the improvement of what is unreclaimed; that of benefiting either by any increase in the value of farm produce that may occur during the course of the lease, or by any of the various contingencies that in a series of years may and do tend to augment the value of landed property. For this cession of rights the landlord may very reasonably expect some compensating advantage. Now philanthropy apart, (and, considering the character of Irish landlords as popularly painted, we shrink from attributing undue influence to that unselfish virtue,) there is little inducement to a landlord to give a lease except the hope of ultimate advantage to his property. If, however, at the expiration of a fifty or sixty years' occupation (and the principle, if just for sixty, is equally so for 160 years), the owner of the soil is to be called on, before he can resume possession or revise his rental, to pay the prime cost of every drain made, every boulder removed, every fence planted half a century before, provided the value created by that outlay be still unexhausted, it must be obvious that to have given a lease

accepted by the small farmers of Scotland. It may be observed that Mr. Curling's calculation limits the tenant's increased receipts from the improvements effected to the amount of the increased *letting value* of the land. Possibly the Scotch tenant improving on a twenty-one years' lease may take into consideration that his actual gain is at least as much again as the increased *letting value*, according to the old rule—'one third to the land, one third to the landlord, and 'one third to the tenant.'

is to him an injury instead of a benefit. The injury consists in this. The landlord who in the year 1926 would have to pay 100*l.*—the prime cost of still unexhausted improvements effected on his estate in the year 1866—will have lost the benefit of the sixty years' enjoyment of those improvements, which as a matter of fact he knows would have repaid him, as they have repaid the person who made them, twice, thrice, perhaps ten times over, the amount of the original expenditure.* What landlord, then, could reasonably be expected to grant a lease of sixty years and bind himself—or more probably his successor—to pay at its close the full value of all unexhausted improvements (which in the case we have supposed would amount to 100*l.*) when by borrowing 100*l.* at 6½ per cent. under the Land Improvement Act, by charging the willing tenant the usual proportion of it, viz. 5 per cent., and by himself paying the remaining 1½ per cent. for twenty-one years—he would at the expiration of that term become the absolute owner of the increased value? In a word, he could not be expected to forego for sixty years the advantages to be gained by an expenditure of 100*l.* which sooner or later he will be obliged to pay, when by an investment of 30*s.* a year for twenty-one years (31*l.* 10*s.*) he can secure for the ensuing thirty-nine years an increased rent of 5*l.* a year—viz., a total sum of 195*l.*, or (deducting the 31*l.* 10*s.* originally spent) of 163*l.* 10*s.*

It seems like waste of time to argue in favour of conceding a principle whose justice is almost universally admitted, and whose acceptance would tend so much to simplify the very difficult task of legislating between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Nor should we have thought of entering at such length into the consideration of it were it not for the fact that it has been again so distinctly asserted in some of the latest publications on the land question,† publications that have called forth considerable praise from the popular press, both of Dublin and the Irish provinces. Mr. J. Fisher, who is favourably known to the public as the author of several valuable statistical works, in his recently published pamphlet on the Land

* A wet field of twenty acres, drained at a cost of 5*l.* per acre, may fairly be expected to yield twenty stones of oats per acre more than it produced before being drained, and a proportionate increase on all the other crops in the rotation. Draining twenty acres at 5*l.* an acre costs 100*l.* Four hundred stones of oats at 3*s.* 1*d.* come to 20*l.* Twenty pounds a year for sixty years amount to 1,200*l.*

† 'The Land Question.' By Joseph Fisher (Dublin: M'Glashan & Gill. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1866).

Question, puts his argument on the principle in dispute in the following words:—

'Natural justice says, no man should be compelled, *without being compensated*, to surrender to another that which represents his labour. He who becomes tenant agrees to give to the landlord, as rent, a portion of the produce of his labour. He is not bound to improve the land. . . . The landlord is therefore only entitled to get back from the tenant-at-will that which he let to him, i.e. the land in the state in which it was when let. . . . A tenant under a lease has an advantage over a tenant-at-will, inasmuch as he can arrange his rotation, and conduct his farm operations more profitably; but the landlord who gives up his power of eviction, and enables the tenant to farm better, requires a *quid pro quo:* he demands a fine for granting the lease, or the tenant is expected to surrender at the end of his term, *without compensation*, that which he created. In other words, the landlord is, by the lease, as regards improvements, made the tenant's heir-in-reversion, to the exclusion of his natural heirs; this is done under the Law of Contracts, but the State should discourage such contracts. If the rent is the fair value, the landlord who receives a full equivalent for the occupancy right should not be entitled to possess himself, *without compensation*, of the tenant's improvements. True it is that the tenant enjoyed the use of them; but they were his own. He had deprived himself of the use of the money expended thereon: no length of enjoyment of a man's own should transfer it to another. These improvements are buildings, or other permanent structures, drains, and the surface improvements which increase the amount of the crops.'

He then states, in allusion, we presume, to the local customs described before Mr. Pusey's Committee, that 'in England the 'outgoing tenant is entitled to compensation for surface improve-'ments, even though there may be a lease;' and he quotes a judgment of Chief Justice Dallas, in the case of Dalby *v.* Hirst, which, though very favourable to the recognition of the English local customs, seems hardly an apt citation of authority in favour of the principle laid down by Mr. Fisher. Judge Dallas's opinion is that—

'It (the custom) is beneficial to both landlord and tenant, the land of the former receiving a lasting benefit from the labour and expense bestowed by the latter, on the payment of a reasonable compensation to him; and the tenant being thereby encouraged to pursue a good course of husbandry by the assurance he has that, *if his continuance on the farm should not enable him to reap the full benefit* of what he has done, he will have a right to call for *proportionate* compensation.'

It is plain that in the passage quoted above the whole question at issue between Mr. Fisher and the overwhelming weight

of opposing opinion on this subject centres in the meaning of the phrase 'without compensation,' which we have italicised. If those words are to be understood in their literal sense, as they fairly might be in the case of a tenant being evicted immediately on the completion of any substantial improvement, Mr. Fisher's proposition is unobjectionable. If the words 'without compensation' are to be understood to mean without double compensation—first from the land and then from the landlord—the proposition will require more convincing proof than any Mr. Fisher has offered in its favour. Again, when Mr. Fisher lays it down that 'no length of enjoyment of a 'man's own should transfer it to another,' we entirely agree with him. But is the tenant's improvement to which he here alludes absolutely the tenant's 'own'? What is the 'improvement' created by draining? It is a development of the latent powers of the soil. To expend money in developing these latent powers may be a more than ordinarily profitable investment. But the extraordinary profit derived from that investment comes neither from the money alone nor from the land alone. The tenant who speaks of the value created by the drainage he has effected as 'his own,' speaks in a certain sense correctly—as the father does who speaks of his 'own' child. But as in the latter case the mother, so in the former case the landlord may surely be justified in claiming a part-ownership in the joint offspring. Mr. Fisher as well as Mr. Butt shares the admiration expressed by Mr. Mill, Mr. Kay, and various other distinguished economists, for a social system founded on a much more extensive subdivision of property than that which obtains in Great Britain. His panacea for Ireland is to transform the present occupiers into owners subject to a fixed rent-charge. As the proposal made by Mr. Butt is somewhat similar to this, we shall wait to consider them both together. But we may here observe that Mr. Fisher is so far carried away by his desire to see a Peasant Proprietary created in Ireland, that he almost ignores the fact that the encouragement by the Legislature of improving leases is one of the chief objects to which the present leaders of the Tenant-right party have of late devoted themselves; nay, he seems to go out of his way to decry the advantages that the Irish tenant might be supposed to derive from any security of tenure not unlimited in duration. He concludes the chapter on Leases with the following words:—

'The granting of leases must fail in the very point where society is most interested—the improvement of tillage, and the increase of food; nor will it allay the prevailing discontent, inasmuch as it conflicts with the interests of individuals, is opposed to the dictates of

common sense, and contrary to natural right, to require the tenant to surrender his improvements, whether there be a lease or not, without compensation.'

From Mr. Fisher's opinion as to the value of leases, it may not be inapt to appeal to that of Mr. O'Connell. In a speech delivered in 1843, Mr. O'Connell said,

'My plan is, that the tenant shall be allowed for the full value of his labour and improvements *unless he gets a renewed lease.* My plan is, that no man should be a tenant paying rent for a less term *than twenty-one years.*'

We have already said that the solution of the land question proposed by Mr. Butt in his 'Plea for the Celtic Race' is somewhat similar to that advocated by Mr. Fisher. Whatever the public may think of Mr. Butt's proposition on other grounds, they cannot, at least, deny it the merit of simplicity. He would transform for sixty years all the present occupiers of land in Ireland—whether tenants-at-will or leaseholders—into owners subject to a head-rent which is to be fixed by valuation; while, for the same period of time, all present owners would become, as it were, mortgagees of all such portions of their properties as may not be now in their actual occupation. The definition given by him of his 'great principle' is 'fixity of tenure at a 'fair rent;' and the mode by which he proposes to apply this principle is, to enact 'that every man now holding an agricul-'tural tenement should continue to hold it as long as he pays a 'fair rent and conforms to the conditions which his landlord has 'any moral right to impose.' What Mr. Butt calls 'The Great 'Charter of enfranchisement of the serfs of Ireland' would enact that on any tenant 'under any tenure' expressing a wish to become perpetual lessee, the future rent should be fixed by valuation, and that a 'local tribunal' should declare him tenant at that rent for a term of sixty years. The two chief reasons urged by Mr. Butt in support of his proposition are, the progress of emigration and the existence of Fenianism. Speaking of these, he says: 'A very little reflection will satisfy anyone 'that both have their origin in the dissatisfaction with the 'system of landed property which has taken hold of the minds 'of the people.'

A passion for emigration appears to have seized upon a whole class. It is not the proof or the result of individual suffering, but of general discontent. The people believe they have not fair play under the present land laws, and they despair of a change. Fenianism, Mr. Butt tells us, is not a political or even a national movement, but a social one. Whatever is political or national in its objects is subordinate to the desire of social

change—the wish to destroy landlordism. It is a war against the institutions of landed property. It is anti-English because with the people landlordism and the land system are the impersonation of English domination and misrule. It has made its way with the masses in a manner it never could have done if discontent had not rankled into hatred of all institutions connected with property in land. Both its existence and its power over the people are to be traced to the prevailing discontent on the land question. Such are the deliberate opinions on Fenianism of the very able advocate who, from being professionally engaged to defend the leaders of that unfortunate movement in their late trials, may be expected to have a more perfect knowledge than almost anyone, not actually a member of the Brotherhood, of the motives and objects of its chiefs. Mr. Butt then discusses the question whether this disaffection is a mere antagonism to the rights of property, inconsistent with the arrangements of civilised life, or only the expression of a dissatisfaction with causes of complaint which can be removed. His opinion is that, 'when we carefully examine the origin of 'these discontents, we shall see that it only needs a courageous 'wisdom to remove their cause, and conciliate the Irish people 'to the laws which now only produce a sentiment of hate.' His proposition for removing these discontents, and thus checking the progressing emigration, which he believes to be one of their results, we have already stated. Throughout his very ably written pamphlet a great deal of illustrative matter is introduced, and an accurate and eloquent history is given of the various causes which have led to the present state of affairs in Ireland. But his main object throughout is to prove, first, that the present evils to be dealt with are emigration and that sullen deep-seated discontent whose overt manifestation is Fenianism: secondly, that his scheme of fixity of tenure at rents determined by compulsory valuation would both check emigration and remove disaffection: thirdly, that no less revolutionary measure would effect those results. Mr. Butt is well aware, as indeed no man of his experience and ability could fail to be, that his proposition will be very generally regarded as revolutionary:—

'But,' he says, 'to conceal or even palliate the truth, is a criminal trifling with a question that is vital to the very existence of the Irish nation. No one who views the question as I do, can write the whole truth without appearing to minister—nay, it may be without actually ministering—to passions which no wise man would willingly excite. Yet to avoid the discussion of subjects associated with these passions, is but to shut our eyes to the real state of things

which is around us. The passions are there whether we notice them or not. They are destroying all social relations: they are eating away the heart of the nation. The time is come when we must boldly and fearlessly look the question, with all its difficulties, in the face—when we must estimate the force and the effect of the passions and prejudices which pervade the different classes of Irish society—passions and prejudices which it is but childish folly to ignore. To write freely and boldly on this subject is an attempt to which the warning may be well applied—

"Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso."

Neither can I conceal from myself that the views I take upon this question lead me to proposals in which I must encounter prejudices which I respect. The measures which I believe absolutely essential to the well-being of all classes, will be denounced as opposed to the rights of property. It is only after long and careful investigation, that I have brought my own mind to the conviction that the condition of the country absolutely requires, and therefore justifies, such a measure. It is, I repeat, with unfeigned respect for the prejudices, if it be just to call them so, which I encounter, that I venture to submit to the calm consideration of others the reasons which have brought conviction to my own mind. I am sure that the day will come when it will be acknowledged that measures such as I suggest would be in the true interest of the owners of the soil.'

The foregoing extract will give a fair idea of the manner and spirit of Mr. Butt's essay. The space at our command will not, however, allow of our following the course of his argument, or indeed of doing much more than recommending his pamphlet to the attention of those who take an interest in the subject of which it treats. We shall confine our remarks to the first of Mr. Butt's two main propositions—viz., that the daily decrease in the population of Ireland is a direct effect of the land laws, and that his scheme—and his scheme alone—would suffice to check that emigration. In proof of his assertion, Mr. Butt tells us (pp. 11, 12), 'That the people refuse 'to remain in the country. . . . That they are being driven 'from the land. . . . That if the emigration goes on a few 'years more at the present rate, the old Celtic race will be 'gone from Ireland. . . . That complaints of a scarcity 'of labour are daily heard. . . . That farms must soon be 'untenanted from want of occupiers.' Now we must be permitted to doubt the entire accuracy of the deductions from these and similar statements scattered through Mr. Butt's pamphlet. They are borne out neither by the recorded statistics of emigration, nor by the careful observation of those whose

intimate practical knowledge of every-day life in Ireland enables them to form, and justifies them in expressing, an authoritative opinion on the subject. It is in no way more obvious that the decrease by 2,400,000 of the population of Ireland in the twenty years between 1841 and 1861 can be attributed solely to the evil operation of the land laws, than that the corresponding increase of 2,020,000 in the twenty years between 1814 and 1834 was caused by those same laws, backed by the then existing religious disabilities of the Roman Catholics. It is doubtless quite true that a very large number of evictions have taken place since 1847, and that a great majority of those evicted have emigrated. It is also quite true, as Mr. Butt asserts, that there are still every year a number of evictions throughout Ireland, and that those evicted almost always emigrate. But is it equally certain that any alteration of the land laws—even one giving fixity of tenure at a reserved rent—would have kept all these people at home? The returns of evictions lately moved for by the Earl of Belmore show that in the last six years there have been in all Ireland 37,164 ejectments. Of these two-thirds were for non-payment of rent. Now as payment of rent is included amongst the obligations to which, under Mr. Butt's scheme, a tenant would be subjected, it is not clear that fixity of tenure on those terms would have saved these 25,000 poor ruined people from eviction. It may, moreover, be not unworthy of observation that, notwithstanding the security of tenure conferred by the tenant-right custom in Ulster, that province furnishes to the list of evictions during the past six years one-third of the total number that have taken place in Ireland. It is, however, a fact well known to everyone closely observing the progress of the emigration from Ireland that in very rare instances—so rare indeed as barely to suffice for the proverbial proving of the rule—are the emigrants persons who have been *solvent* landholders. Many of them, no doubt, have been connected with the land, being the junior members of small farmers' families, but their connexion with it has not been severed by any law which Mr. Butt's proposition would rob of its powers. In the days when, under the long leases of the middlemen, the indefinite subdivision of farms was encouraged rather than as now prevented, many of the men who are now emigrating would have got shares of their fathers' farms, while the women would have found husbands at home amongst the early-marrying sons of their neighbours. The universal discouragement of subdivision is one great cause of the continued emigration; and as a contract 'not to subdivide without the landlord's consent' is

included in Mr. Butt's scheme, it is not obvious that even fixity of tenure on these terms would tend to check the emigration. An incident which lately came within our notice would tend to show that neither eviction nor voluntary surrender of land is the prime cause of the emigration movement. A Roman Catholic priest was deploring the increasing exodus of the Irish people, and instanced the case of his own parish, where the population four years before was about 4,000, and from which during that time, nearly 500 individuals had emigrated. When asked whether there had been many evictions, or whether many of the small farmers were going away, his reply was, 'No; there are only two houses less in my parish now than 'there were four years ago!' The number of houses in his parish was about 800!

Mr. Butt also makes allusion to the scarcity of labourers in certain districts. It is no doubt quite true that in many parts of Ireland loud complaints are heard during the seasons of haymaking and harvest of the want of hands. But when it is remembered that the ordinary rate of wages in some of those districts is still not more than five or six shillings a week, and that in the dull season there are more men seeking employers than employers seeking men, many will be disposed to turn a doubting ear to such complaints. The farmers' cry that there are no longer hands to be had, not unfrequently means that there are no longer hands to be had at starvation wages. While we write an Irish local journal lies before us in which the complaint of want of hands is re-echoed, while in the next column is given a list of the thousands of harvest-men who have gone from the same district to reap the harvests of England and Scotland, heedless of their neighbours who are crying out for men. It is sufficiently evident that in that district at least the desideratum is not more men but more wages. Happily, however, the rate of wages for farm labour has much increased in many districts, although it is still far below the English or Scottish standard. In August last a Cork journal described the excitement caused by the return from America of a large body of late emigrants who, disappointed in obtaining there the great increase of wages (as compared with expenses of living) from what they had been previously earning at home, had retraced their voyage across the Atlantic and resumed their former occupations. Such an instance—even if it be a solitary one—would go far to prove that a great part of the 'dissatisfaction' which is taking the Irish labourer to America is dissatisfaction with low wages and uncertainty of employment.

The Fenian programme included a redistribution of the land in Ireland. The small farmers who joined the insurrection were to be rewarded by being made the owners of their farms. Of the larger holdings, whether occupied by the owners or by capitalist tenants, all that remained—after the Fenian leaders had been provided for—was to be parcelled out amongst the rank and file of the republican army. Under such a scheme one could conceive that there might have been created, and (at any rate for a generation) have been supported in Ireland a population even larger than that which existed before the famine. But Mr. Butt's proposal, which lacks the boldness of that made by his late clients, would neither provide for the growth of an increased population on the prairies of Meath, Tipperary, and Roscommon, nor would it, by permitting subdivision, encourage in other districts the process which before the famine raised the total of Ireland's population to upwards of eight millions. His scheme would leave to the 'exterminators' of the past the full enjoyment of their 'consolidated' grazing farms, while it would punish those who had hitherto acted up to the maxim of 'Live and let live,' by depriving them for ever of the first great right of an *owner*—that of *tilling his own land himself.*

While fully admitting the ability as well as the general accuracy and moderation of tone (except in a few instances) which distinguish the 'Plea for the Celtic Race,' we cannot think that its publication will afford any aid towards effecting a legislative settlement of the Irish Land Question. Mr. Butt may now be said to stand alone in upholding the extreme doctrines of fixity of tenure and compulsory valuation. On the first appearance of the Tenant Compensation Bill proposed by the late Government, the O'Donoghue committed himself for a brief period to a similar expression of opinion, but his subsequent hearty acceptance of the proposed measure may be assumed to be proof that on reflection he saw—if not the injustice, at least the impracticability—of the more revolutionary proposition. Mr. J. S. Mill, the favourite authority of popular writers on the Irish Land Question, has long since deserted the ground that Mr. Butt has so lately advanced to occupy. He at one time proposed 'to make the whole land of 'Ireland the property of the tenants subject to the rents now 'paid as a fixed rent-charge;' but even in proposing this he provided (which Mr. Butt has forgotten to do) 'for compen-'sating the landlords for the present value of the chances of 'increase which they would be prospectively required to

'forego.'* But in the later edition of Mr. Mill's works, he says that 'the opinions he formerly expressed are no longer 'susceptible of practical application.' That Ireland is 'no 'longer in a condition to require what may be called heroic 'remedies;' and that the 'benefit to Ireland of peasant pro-'prietorship are no longer indispensable; a prospect having 'opened to her of making a great advance in civilisation 'without that aid.' Finally, such extreme doctrines were, as we have seen, repudiated by all those able exponents of the present popular feeling in Ireland who were specially chosen to explain the case and notify the wishes of the Irish tenant to the Committee of 1865.

Before passing from Mr. Butt's proposition to the consideration of the juster and more practicable one made by the late Government, it may not be out of place to say a few words on Mr. Bright's lately proposed scheme for creating a Peasant Proprietary Class in Ireland. It is unfortunately the case that almost any proposition having Mr. Bright for its author is certain to meet with a large share of discredit and opposition. So it has fared with his late proposal. Revolution, communism, confiscation, were the epithets freely bestowed on a scheme whose chief defect was that it was impracticable. That it was impracticable—that is to say that in its numerous and complicated details it must almost of necessity break down in operation—it is not difficult to foresee.

Mr. Bright has based his whole proposal on a too common fallacy, viz. that security of tenure is all that is required by the present occupiers of land in Ireland to ensure their prosperity. What is in truth required is security that a really improving tenant shall not be dispossessed without compensation for the value he has created. Security of tenure to the energetic and industrious would doubtless be a strong incentive to increased exertion. Security of tenure to the pauper or the idler would be as often an injury as a benefit either to the individual or to the community.

There is a popular tendency in Ireland towards seeking the redress of political and social grievances elsewhere than from the British Parliament. Anyone who could check that popular inclination by proving that there is at least one powerful section of British politicians who honestly desire to make common

---

* Mr. Butt (p. 66) alludes to the right of property here asserted, but declares that 'The possible and speculative right to some future 'and contingent value is not one for which present security ought 'to be given up.'

cause with Irishmen in seeking the reform of admitted abuses, would have done much to loyalise the popular feeling in Ireland. If therefore Mr. Bright had contented himself with assuring his Irish hearers of the sympathy and support of that section of British Reformers whom he represents, his visit to Dublin might have been productive of real good. But there was no useful end to be gained by introducing so crude a scheme as that which he propounded; while the cause of the Irish tenant is likely to be injured rather than benefited by the use of such hasty and irritating language as that for which Mr. Bright has been so ably called to account by Lord Dufferin.*

The Bill of Mr. Chichester Fortescue proposed to give the tenant liberty, without consultation with or notice to his landlord, to make any outlay he thought fit on his farm, and to secure to him, if ever evicted, the right to repayment by his landlord of a sum representing the increased value of his farm at the close, as compared with the commencement of his tenancy—that value to be assessed by an officially appointed valuator. This proposal encountered very strong opposition from the Conservative portion of the Irish representatives, on the ground that it would be an unjust interference with the rights of an owner to force him to purchase property he might prefer to be without. On the other hand, it was warmly supported by those Irish members specially returned to Parliament to represent the interests of the tenant, and received the very general assent of the Liberal press in Ireland. There appeared, however, in the proposed Bill another clause—the 29th—which not only failed to receive the same support, but which was denounced by a high authority amongst the Tenant-right party,† as one that 'would com-'pletely nullify all the advantageous provisions made in the 'rest of the Bill,' inasmuch as 'if the tenant be not secured 'against private contracts imposed by the landlord . . . . 'the country will regard the Bill as utterly worthless.' The obnoxious clause was somewhat ambiguously worded. Some understood it as excluding from the benefit of the proposed Act those cases only where there already existed a written contract with respect to improvements, either restraining the tenant from doing certain things, or binding him as part of his

* Lord Dufferin's letter to 'The Times' on 'Irish Emigration,' December 11th, 1866.

† The Right Rev. Bishop Gillooly, in a speech at the National Association. Dublin: May 15th, 1866.

bargain to make some specific outlay. Under this head would come the contracts to reclaim waste land under the nineteen years' improving leases already alluded to as being not uncommon in Scotland. The clause was interpreted by others as giving a landlord the power to let his land under a written contract to be entered into after the passing of the Act—by which the tenant would be bound not to make any improvements whatever. It was popularly represented that this was a power of which the landlords would very generally avail themselves, and that therefore a Bill which did not deprive them of that power would be practically useless. It certainly seems almost incredible that any body of educated men could be so blind to their own interests as to forbid the execution of *bonâ fide* value-creating improvements on their properties. But admitting for the sake of argument that this popular belief in the perversity of Irish landlords is well founded, it is evident that striking out the 29th clause of Mr. Fortescue's Act would not deprive them of the power objected to, or force them into an unwilling acceptance of the proffered boon. Let us for a moment suppose that the 29th clause were struck out, and that the law were absolutely to forbid a landlord to insert in any lease or written contract a proviso that no houses should be built, no roads made, no fences erected or taken away without his consent, what must be the inevitable result? It is plain that the landlord—we mean the landlord as popularly painted—would defend himself by never giving any leases at all. By invariably refusing leases, and by keeping a close watch over his property, a landlord could, if he so willed it, put as complete a stop to 'improvements' being made contrary to his desire—as he could have done under the 29th clause of Mr. Fortescue's Act. The law certainly would allow the tenant to build a house on the property of an unwilling landlord, and would give him an absolute claim (subject to the public valuator's assent) to the cost of that house if evicted. But the landlord on finding that the tenant persisted in going on with any work after a warning not to do so, might serve him with a notice to quit. The tenant, no doubt, would be repaid the cost of his labour—but he would also lose his farm, and the natural result would be that no other tenant on the estate would ever again attempt a work which he might consider an improvement without being first assured that his landlord agreed with him in his estimate of its probable usefulness.

We have pointed out how the 29th clause in truth gives the landlord no power that he would not still have if the Bill were

passed without it—not because we think it a power likely to be generally used, but in order to show that the principle maintained in that clause—viz., that of giving some veto to the landlord in certain cases of proposed expenditure by the tenant—is one that can be got rid of in no other way but by giving absolute *fixity of tenure* to the occupier. Now the demand for fixity of tenure is one that has not only not been put forward, but has been distinctly repudiated by all the recognised leaders of the late agitation on the Land Question in Ireland, and by none more distinctly than by Bishop Keane, who in his evidence already quoted, said he did not even 'think that any law could '*compel* a landlord to grant a lease.' We cannot, therefore, help observing the want of logical consistency in a policy that repudiates the doctrine of fixity of tenure, and yet insists on depriving the landlord of a power which nothing short of giving fixity of tenure to the tenant can take from him.

Although a few minor objections have been raised against other clauses of Mr. Fortescue's Bill, we may fairly represent it as having, with the exception of the 29th clause, been on the whole approved of and accepted as a reasonable settlement of the question by those who represent the interests of the tenant class. The Bill has not, however, been equally fortunate in meeting the approval of the organs of Tory landlordism. It is eminently suggestive of the difficulties attending the settlement of the disputes between Irish landlords and their tenants, to find that the identical section which is supposed by the friends of the latter to contain the essence of good in the Bill, is the very one which the landlord party describe as 'a 'measure of confiscation.' The tenant insists on his right to compensation for improvements effected even contrary to his landlord's wish. The landlord refuses to pay for anything to which he has not absolutely assented. Mr. Fortescue's Bill, like the bystander at an Irish fair, steps in with a sort of compromise, or 'splitting of the difference,' and proposes that the tenant shall be entitled to receive, and the landlord be bound to pay for, the unexhausted value of all improvements created by the tenant with the landlord's *tacit consent.*

We have already said, that although we think the Bill proposed by the late Government was just in principle, it was far from faultless in detail. In the first place, although the periods of beneficial occupancy named in it are decidedly amendments on those fixed by the Act of 1860, they are still susceptible of improvement. On the one side, the extension of the compensating period in the case of drainage to thirty-one years seems

to be needlessly liberal to the tenant;* while, on the other, forty-one years is too short a term to allow for buildings such as are contemplated in the Act. We do not think that a tenure of forty-one years will or ought to be a sufficient inducement to any tenant to sink his money in substantial houses or farm-buildings. Mr. Curling in his evidence suggested a beneficial occupancy of ninety-nine years for buildings and of forty-one years for reclamation. The Government have adopted his advice as to the latter, and we think they would have improved their Bill as a working measure by following it in the case of buildings also—if not to the full extent of ninety-nine years, at least to seventy, the limit proposed by Lord Dufferin. Again, there is no provision in the Bill to limit the increase of rent in the case we have supposed, to any specified interest on the capital sunk. Lord Naas hit this blot in the Bill in his speech on its introduction, and his objection remained unanswered. We are strongly of opinion that the principle of Mr. Cardwell's Act was not only more equitable, but that it would operate far more favourably both as an encouragement of tenants' improvements, and as a discouragement of eviction or the frequent revision of rentals. There would be no difficulty in awarding the tenant, instead of the 7*l.* 2*s.* per. cent. annuity of Mr. Cardwell's Act, a lump sum which would represent its value. This, as Mr. Curling says, 'was 'fair towards the tenant because it was considered that each 'year's beneficial occupancy was tantamount in value to one 'year's annuity, and it was an inducement to the landlord to 'leave him in undisturbed possession, because each year's occu-'pancy diminished the amount proportionately of the tenant's 'claim.' It is difficult to discover on what principle a measure is founded which would give to a tenant evicted after thirty years' enjoyment the cost price of his unexhausted improvements, and yet would give absolutely nothing to the tenant evicted the following year.

The 31st clause, to which we have not before adverted, and which provides that the offer of a lease of thirty-one years

* The 'tenant-right' custom in Leicestershire, as to draining executed by the tenant, is as follows: 'When the landlord finds the 'tiles and the tenant the labour, and only one crop follows before 'the tenant removes, he is allowed three-fourths of the cost of the 'labour, and so on, diminishing the allowance by one-fourth for 'each crop taken. If the tenant finds tiles as well as labour, the 'term extends to six years, the allowance diminishing one-sixth for 'every crop taken.' (*Farming in Leicestershire—Journal of Royal Agricultural Society of England*, 1866.)

shall operate as a bar to the tenant's claim for compensation, we think, with Mr. Curling, 'cannot reasonably be objected to 'by either party,' and will, it may be hoped, induce many landlords to give leases to improving tenants.

The last point to which we wish to direct attention is the absence of any effective machinery for enabling a valuator, if called on for an award, to arrive at a fair decision. In the Act of 1860, where not only preliminary notice and estimates of cost, but also registration of the improvement on its completion were required, no such difficulty existed. But under Mr. Fortescue's Act, a case might arise where a tenant had drained a field twenty years before he was threatened with eviction or with revaluation of his farm; but the value created by his expenditure would never have been accurately ascertained during the whole of that period. No machinery for registering even the prime cost of an improvement is furnished by the Bill—nor, indeed, is any registration insisted on. Whenever the necessity for investigating the tenant's claim arises, if the landlord and tenant cannot agree as to the amount, either party may call in the aid of a valuator from the Board of Works, who may investigate the case on oath, may call for the production of any necessary and available documents, and may award such compensation as shall in his opinion be equivalent to the increase in the letting value created by such improvements. It must be evident to any practical man—especially to anyone conversant with the habits and ideas of that class of Irish tenants in whose interest the demand for legislation is chiefly made—that the proposed plan, if found workable at all, which we doubt, would in most cases end in bitter disappointment to the tenant. An excellent authority on such a subject—Mr. William Levinge, principal of the General Arbitration and Improvement of Land Office, Dublin—has published in the form of a letter to Mr. Chichester Fortescue some very valuable remarks and suggestions as to this portion of the proposed Bill, which he concludes in these words: 'I 'venture to say not even the Commissioner of Valuation himself, 'who is the highest authority in Ireland on such subjects, could 'make the required valuations accurately or satisfactorily, on 'the system provided in the 37th section of the Government 'Bill.'

With the few exceptions we have mentioned—which, excluding registration and the sliding scale of compensating periods, are rather matters of detail than of principle—we think the Bill proposed by the late Government would, in the present state of the Irish land question, be as fair a settlement

for both landlord and tenant as is likely to be devised. Were the demand for retrospective legislation still urged by the chosen representatives of the tenants' interests, we could not, as we have before said, refuse to consider the justice of it; for we are much disposed to hold with Lord Dufferin that 'unless the past is first dealt with, it will be impossible to come 'to a just settlement with regard to the future;' and with Mr. Drummond, that 'to trust to contracts regulating *future* deal-'ings is possible, while for the *past* it is evidently impossible'—nevertheless the demand being no longer made, we accept its absence as the removal of at least one obstacle to success. If, however, the present Government adopt the advice of the late Lord-Lieutenant for Ireland, and following the precedent of 1852 (when they proposed not only prospective but retrospective legislation), 'endeavour to devise a measure better suited to the 'state of Ireland than that proposed by the Government of Earl 'Russell or Mr. Gladstone,' we hope that no party-feelings and no ignoble jealousy will induce the Liberal members of Parliament to withhold from such a measure that hearty support which Lord Kimberley has promised to give to it. We have it on the high authority of the late Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland that 'it is impossible for England to perform its duty to Ireland 'as long as no attempt is made to deal with the important 'question of the tenure of land; . . . that the land question 'is the one which most of all interests the people of Ireland, 'and that it is one which, he was convinced, Parliament should 'first consider and first endeavour to solve.' These are remarkable words coming from a statesman of Lord Kimberley's character, position, and ability, and their importance will certainly not be lessened when it is known that before the late Lord-Lieutenant went to Ireland, and until he had had an opportunity of judging for himself as to the difference between the relations of Irish landlords with their tenants and those that subsist between the same classes in England and Scotland, he was most strongly opposed to the idea of any exceptional legislation on the Irish Land Question. Lord Kimberley's evidence is that of an able and impartial witness, and is therefore peculiarly valuable, while the opinion he expressed in the same speech as to the mode of bringing about a settlement of this much-vexed question is eminently deserving of consideration by all parties. 'There are,' said Lord Kimberley, 'some sub-'jects in which a settlement ought to be brought about by an 'agreement of both sides of the House, and I am convinced 'that Irish questions are amongst them. Ireland is a country 'with which English statesmen have been singularly unsuccess-

'ful in dealing; but if we can devise any measure by which 'that country can be brought more into sympathy with the rest 'of the United Kingdom, by which we shall touch the hearts 'of the people—which we have never yet touched—we shall 'add to the glory and strength of the Empire more than by 'any other measures we can possibly devise.'*

Unconvinced, however, by the reiterated opinions of impartial observers, there are still many in Ireland who habitually speak of the tenant-right agitation as a sham. Such persons affirm that a large majority of the small farmers have not got the means, or the intelligence, or the industry—even were they made owners in fee of the farms they now hold as yearly tenants—to set about making such improvements as those contemplated by any Tenant Compensation Bill ever yet proposed. They point, on the one side, to the 300,000 families living on farms of less than fifteen acres, and whom platform orators represent as only requiring security for improvements to turn those farms into gardens—and, on the other, they quote the evidence of the popular witnesses before the Committee of 1865, who agreed in fixing the limit of from fifteen to twenty acres as the least extent of land on which it was possible for a family to live in comfort—or which it would be reasonable to expect a landlord to let on lease.† They point to the disastrous effects of long leases in the past in causing interminable subdivision under middlemen, and thus creating a dense population of paupers to be a prey to the famine which starved them by thousands in 1846. They quote innumerable existing instances of leases for ever or freeholds at nominal rents where the lessees or the freeholders are only to be distinguished from their neighbours by a more than ordinary poverty and absence of improvement. They call the popular demand for security from spoliation a 'Priests' agitation,' and they quote the authority of Mr. Lowe to prove that 'it is the interest of the 'Irish priesthood to have the land subdivided.' They describe the progressing emigration as a healthful blood-letting rather than an exhausting hemorrhage, and maintain that—whether it be the one or the other—it is entirely uninfluenced by the land question. Such as these are the opinions openly expressed by the great body of the Irish gentry, by their organs in the press,

---

* Speech of the Earl of Kimberley on the Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance Bill, August 5th, 1866. (*The Times.*)

† See evidence of Bishop Keane and Mr. Dillon. Answers (3819), (3820), (2108), (2109).

and by most of their chosen representatives in Parliament. But allowing that the expectations of those demanding legislation in the tenants' behalf to be exaggerated—allowing that there may be a foundation for at least some of the opinions which we have just quoted—there still remain uncontroverted the following facts. That the Irish people are seriously discontented. That they themselves attribute their discontent in great measure to the existing relations between landlord and tenant. That every statesman of any eminence who has lived within the last twenty years has at one time or another admitted the necessity of legislation, while the evil they have all acknowledged still remains practically unabated. And that the progressing emigration from Ireland—be it economically speaking an evil or a good—is assuredly strengthening day by day the anti-British feeling in a very powerful neighbouring State—already not too friendly to England or the English. It has been often repeated of late, and probably with truth, that Fenianism in its origin was entirely unconnected with either the Land or the Established Church question. But can anyone for a moment believe that the seditious efforts of such men as Stephens or his Irish-American accomplices could have had any effect in disturbing the peace or alarming the executive of any country whose people were contented and who believed that they were being justly ruled? These, after all, are momentous considerations, not for Irish landlords alone but for the entire Empire. Happily there are daily growing indications that some English statesmen are becoming convinced of the necessity for dealing with Ireland in a large and liberal spirit. Nor do we despair of all possibility that the landlords of Ireland may be brought to recognise their true interests in ceding some of the extreme privileges enjoyed by their class, in exchange for that incomparably higher and more noble privilege—that of living amongst a friendly, a contented, and a loyal people.

ART. VII.—1. *Early English Alliterative Poems* (about 1320–30 A.D.). Edited by R. MORRIS, Esq., from a unique Cottonian MS. 1864.

2. *Arthur* (about 1440 A.D.). Edited by F. J. FURNIVALL, Esq., M.A., from the Marquis of Bath's unique MS. 1864.

3. *W. Lauder's Tractate Concernyng ye Office and Dewtie of Kyngis, etc.* (1566 A.D.) Edited by F. HALL, Esq., D.C.L. 1864.

4. *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* (about 1320–30 A.D.). Edited by R. MORRIS, Esq., from a unique Cottonian MS. 1864.

5. *Of the Orthographie and Congruitie of the Britan Tongue, a treates noe shorter then necessarie, be* ALEXANDER HUME. Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the British Museum (about 1617 A.D.), by HENRY B. WHEATLEY, Esq. 1865.

6. *Lancelot of the Laik.* Edited from the unique MS. in the Cambridge University Library (about 1500), by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, M.A. 1865.

7. *The Story of Genesis and Exodus in English Verse of about* 1300 A.D. Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by R. MORRIS, Esq. 1865.

8. *Morte Arthure: the Alliterative Version.* Edited from Robert Thornton's unique MS. (about 1440 A.D.) at Lincoln, by the Rev. GEORGE PERRY, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln. 1865.

9. *Animadversions uppon the Annotacions and Corrections of some Imperfections of Impressiones of Chaucer's Workes, reprinted in* 1598; *by* FRANCIS THYNNE. Edited from the unique MS. in the Bridgewater Library, by G. H. KINGSLEY, Esq., M.D. 1865.

10. *Merlin, or the Early History of Arthur.* Edited for the first time from the unique MS. in the Cambridge University Library (about 1450 A.D.), by HENRY B. WHEATLEY, Esq. Part I., 1865.

11. *Lyndesay's Monarche.* Edited from the first edition by JHONE SKOTT, in 1552, by FITZEDWARD HALL, Esq., D.C.L. Part I. 1865.

12. *The Wright's Chaste Wife, a Merry Tale,* by ADAM of COBSAM (about 1462 A.D.), from the unique Lambeth MS.

306. Edited for the first time by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 1865.

13. *Seinte Marherete, þe Meiden ant Martyr.* Three Texts of about A.D. 1200, 1310, 1330. First edited in 1862, by the Rev. Oswald Cockayne, M.A., and now re-issued. 1866.

14. *The Romance of Kyng Horn, Floris and Blancheflour, and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.* Edited from the MS. in the Library of the University of Cambridge, by the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, M.A. 1866.

15. *Political, Religious, and Love Poems,* from the Lambeth MS., No. 306, and other MSS. Edited by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 1866.

16. *A Tretice in Englisch breuely drawe out of þe book of Quintis essencijs in Latyn, þat Hermys þe prophete and king of Egipt, after þe flood of Noe, fader of Philosophris, hadde by reuelacioun of an aungil of God to him sente.* Edited from the Sloane MS. 73, by F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A. 1866.

17. *Parallel Extracts from 29 MSS. of Piers Plowman, with comments, and a Proposal for the Society's Three-text edition of the Poem.* By the Rev. W. W. Skeat, M.A. 1866.

18. *Hali Meidenhad,* about 1200 A.D. Edited for the first time from the MS. (with a translation), by the Rev. Oswald Cockayne, M.A. 1866.

19. *Sir David Lyndesay's Monarche, Part II., the Complaynt of the King's Papingo, and other Minor Poems.* Edited from the first editions, by Fitzedward Hall, Esq., D.C.L. 1866.

20. *English Prose Treatises of Richard Rolle de Hampole* (who died A.D. 1349). Edited from Robert Thornton's MS. (cir. 1440 A.D.) By George G. Perry, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln and Rector of Waddington; editor of 'Morte Arthure.' 1866.

21. *Merlin, or the Early History of Arthur.* Part II. 1866.

A hundred years ago the Rev. Thomas Percy, who had not then sung himself into a stall, qualified for petty martyrdom by publishing his 'Reliques of Ancient English 'Poetry.' They had not been out a month when Bishop Warburton wrote to Hurd, who in the same year became also a Bishop, 'It is as you say of Percy's Ballads. Antiquarianism

'is, indeed, to true letters what specious funguses are to the 'oak, which never shoot out and flourish till all the vigour 'and virtue of the grove be effete and nearly exhausted.' If that was truly said in 1765 of Percy's 'Reliques,' what may be thought in 1867 of the unmitigated antiquarianism displayed in the publications of our newly constituted Early English Text Society, and of the proposal recently made by that Society to print for our benefit the celebrated Ballad Manuscript, the mine from which Percy drew his stores?

For Percy was but a half-hearted antiquary. His object, he said, was 'to please both the judicious antiquary and the reader 'of taste; and he hath endeavoured to gratify both without 'offending either.' To satisfy what he called his 'polished age,' Percy made old poems presentable according to the mode of the eighteenth century; sometimes by such liberal use of the patchbox that where, as he says of the old ballad of 'Sir Cauline,' 'the whole appeared far short of the perfection it seemed to 'deserve, the editor was tempted to add several stanzas in the 'first part, and still more in the second, to connect and com-'plete the story in the manner which appeared to him most 'interesting and affecting.' To the Early English Text Society such editing seems fit neither to please the judicious antiquary nor the reader of taste in this present century. As Percy had said that the greater part of his 'Reliques' were extracted from an ancient folio manuscript in his possession, which contained nearly two hundred poems, songs, and metrical romances, the desire has been great to rub off the Bishop's polish, disregard his arbitrary selection, and print, for those who can more thoroughly appreciate our early literature, an exact and complete copy of the manuscript itself. Leave to borrow it for six months, during which a copy of it is to be made for publication, has now therefore been bought of the Bishop's descendants for a hundred and fifty pounds, and a proposal for its publication has been issued. The MS. contains 196 pieces (some fragments) in a handwriting of the reign of James I. or Charles I. When printed it will form two volumes of about 1,400 pages. Mr. F. J. Furnivall will be responsible for the exactness of the text; the introductions to and collations of the ballads and romances will be by Professor Child, of Harvard, and by Mr. J. W. Hales, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. But as this important publication cannot be included in the ordinary series of volumes issued by this Society, large paper copies at a higher price will be issued to subscribers who may desire to contribute to this monument of our early literature. Thus Bishop Percy's work is being done over again, as he had

neither will nor power to do it in the day when even his imperfect regard for our old literature seemed to Warburton as fungus on the oak—sign of decay.

But Warburton was wrong. Even the feeble movement made by Percy at the right time in the right direction constituted him a power. That bathing in the springs of our own literature which seemed weakening to men trained by critics who allowed no English Abana and Pharpar to be better than their own waters of Israel, really helped to revive the strength of letters in this country. To Percy, who was somewhat weak although not wholly without genius, it gave a strong man's influence. Its parallel was not the fungus upon the decaying tree, but fit nourishment to its roots and quickened flow of sap into its branches. Scott remembered the spot where he read Percy's 'Reliques' for the first time, and believed that he read no other book 'half so frequently, or with half the enthu-'siasm.' Wordsworth thought they had redeemed our poetry, and said, in 1815, 'I do not think there is an able writer in 'verse of the present day who would not be proud to acknow-'ledge his obligations to the "Reliques." I know that it is so 'with my friends; and for myself, I am happy on this occasion 'to make a public avowal of my own.'

We have cited at the head of this article a list of Early English books, edited with a minute regard for accuracy not dreamt of in the antiquarianism of Percy, and which would have pleased Ritson as much as he was angered by Percy's compromises between allegiance to his own century and fidelity to his old texts. For even Ritson, the most accurate student of old English literature in the eighteenth century, who pursued Percy for his bad conscience in literature like one of the Eumenides, and who visited Thomas Warton also for the many sins committed in his 'History of English Poetry,' even Ritson as an editor of old literature was only strong among the weak. Indeed the latest editor of our Early Popular Poetry,* Mr. W. Carew Hazlitt, does not think it too much to say, after comparing Ritson's 'Pieces of Ancient Popular 'Poetry,' published in 1791, and his 'Ancient English Metrical 'Romances,' published in 1803, with the texts he used, not only that Ritson's reputation for extreme accuracy was earned

* 'Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England; collected 'and edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. Carew Hazlitt of the 'Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. In 4 vols. J. R. Smith: 1854–6.' This is by far the fullest and most accurate collection of its kind that has been made in England.

when any degree of accuracy was rare, but that, 'if any one 'should presume, at the present day, to produce texts as 'abounding in blunders as those of the antiquary in question, 'he would be an object of ridicule and contempt to all com- 'petent judges of the manner in which early English literature 'should be edited.' The truth is expressed too strongly, but it is true that such a standard of accuracy as we find recognised, for example, in these publications of the Early English Text Society is of recent adoption. Our editors of old English are many times more antiquarian than Percy was, in the respect they show for the minutest of old forms. But they are none the nearer to being what Warburton would have us think them. The vigorous old tree of English literature will thrive only the more vigorously for their digging of the soil about its roots. It is honourable to English letters, that so many men should be found amongst us competent to perform the duties they have assumed and zealous to discharge them. Their labour cannot be rewarded by profit or by conspicuous fame; but we shall presently show that they deserve all the credit that attaches to well-directed industry and a patriotic devotion to the language and literature of their country; and we hope the public will do its duty by them, by subscribing largely to the very cheap and curious series of their publications.

Percy's 'Reliques' made one step towards a recognition of the truth that *nationality* should characterise in form and substance the expression of the mind of any country. We had been misled, in the brilliant day of French literature, when France was strong under Louis XIV. and England weak under the Stuarts. Had the servile crowd of imitators in England and Germany rightly digested their just admiration of the men of genius who were then, and still remain, the glory of French literature, they would not have followed their teaching with a literal obedience that was in flat contradiction to its spirit. The French strengthened their language by looking back to its main source, when they made conformity with Latin, in structure and vocabulary, a test of its purity. Had we followed their example we should have looked back to the main source of our language also, which is Teutonic, and should have become as diligent for Saxon English as our neighbours were for Latin French. As it was, obeying the rule of the intellect then dominant with a blind literalness, we blundered into alien formalities, and it became usual to call homely English 'low.'

We now know better, but the better knowledge is not of old standing. Reproduction of our early literature, with more or less fidelity to the old texts, was one of the first signs of the

coming change, and the ridicule that Percy's 'Reliques' first encountered came from men who were not yet fairly escaped from the traditions of French critical rule. But they were escaping. Johnson's strong sense carried him steadily forward, and if, in 1765, he laughed at the simplicity of an old English ballad, he some years afterwards condemned his own 'Rambler' as 'too wordy,' and of a writer formed on his own earlier manner—which is very distinct from that which he had matured when, between 1777 and 1781, he was writing the 'Lives of the Poets'—he said, 'if the style of Robertson be 'too wordy, he owes it to me—that is, having too many words, 'and those too big ones.

It would be a long labour, and one beside our purpose, to trace all the causes and effects of that wholesome revolution in the critical taste of England and Germany which had for one of its first aids the renewal of attention to the old national literatures. Fielding and Goldsmith ridiculed the host of the small critics who, judging by French law, decreed their writing 'low' when it dealt with common incidents and common interests of life. But the small critics and small writers, with their infinitely small and tedious respectabilities, were the majority. In England, too, there had been restraint enough to give much impetus to the complete reaction when it came. The German ball in its recoil struck ours and set it rolling. Weary of what they called the *à la mode* age, a strong band of the best German writers had gone back to the sources of their language, dug up the ancient treasures of their literature, revived the old national forms, and trampling on all canons of French criticism, poured themselves out in simple ballads, or ventured in plays and novels into fresh and independent exploration of the mysteries of individual and social life.

In one of his Prefaces of 1830 Scott traces the interest of 'the literary persons of Edinburgh' in German literature to a paper read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh in April 1788 by Mackenzie, the author of 'The Man of Feeling.' And what was it that fixed the attention of the literary persons of Edinburgh upon German literature so strongly as to band them into a class, of which Scott himself was one member, under a German doctor with an incommunicable enthusiasm for Gessner's 'Death of Abel'?

'Those (says Scott) who were from their youth accustomed to admire Shakespeare and Milton, became acquainted for the first time with a race of poets who had the same lofty ambition to spurn the flaming boundaries of the universe, and investigate the realms of Chaos and Old Night; and of dramatists, who, disclaiming the

pedantry of the Unities, sought, at the expense of occasional improbabilities and extravagance, to present life on the stage in its scenes of wildest contrast, and in all its boundless variety of character. . . . Their fictitious narratives, their ballad poetry, and other branches of their literature, which are particularly apt to bear the stamp of the extravagant and the supernatural, began also to occupy the attention of the British literati.'

This new desire to 'spurn the flaming boundaries of the 'universe,' and pay a visit to the 'realms of Chaos,' belonged to the wild pleasure of escape from a long penance of unnatural restraint. Enough of ordering. Now for a plunge into Chaos! So in their metre Scott, Byron, Southey, and others revelled in defiance of every French critical law, and the dash of their irregular verse had a charm of its own for readers weary of the confined round of formalities in rhyme and of the emptiness of artificial dignity. Southey expressed this temper of his time in the lines from George Wither which he took as motto for his 'Curse of Kehama:'—

> 'Pedants shall not tie my strains
> To our antique poets' veins;
> Being born as free as these,
> I will sing as I shall please.'

Schiller, in utter defiance of dead social conventionalities, had made an outlaw his first hero. The same prevalent instinct of rebellion against a despotism of innumerable petty laws, caused Byron to sing of corsairs, and his newly emancipated readers to take heartily and naturally their own ill-regulated pleasure in the change of fare.

Of all these changes a revived study of the early literature of England and Germany—a return of each nation to the springs of its own natural life—was one of the first signs.

This may be well shown by a glance at the work of Johann Jacob Bodmer, of Zurich, the free Swiss who first sounded for literary Germany the note of freedom, and led German writers to their war of independence. He was eleven years older than Samuel Johnson, but lived, working to the last, until within a few months of the end of Johnson's life; Bodmer dying in 1783, Johnson in 1784. Bodmer had been well trained in classical study, and had fastened especially on Ovid's 'Meta-'morphoses,' the Latin book which of all others had most attraction for our early writers, and out of which story after story was poured through the verse of Chaucer and Gower. All but one of the tales in Chaucer's 'Legend of Good 'Women' are from the 'Metamorphoses' and the 'Epistles' of Ovid, and so are eight-and-twenty of the tales in the 'Con-

'fessio Amantis.' Bodmer, with a distinct purpose of endeavouring to purify and nationalise the German taste, established at Zurich with his friend Breitinger a journal on the model of Addison's 'Spectator,' and by that and by other critical writings, great and small, not only earned the name of the Reformer of the German Language, but after a ten years' fight deposed the critical dictator Gottsched, who ruled German letters by French law, from his throne at Leipzig. In 1744 seceders from Gottsched joined in establishing and supporting the 'Bremische Beiträge,' and Bodmer numbered the most promising young men in Germany among his allies and supporters. He defended Milton's English epic against Gottsched's French-classical condemnation, in a book justifying Milton's choice of subject and the details of his plan. To this book he appended a translation of Addison's twelve essays from the 'Spectator' on the beauties of each of the twelve books of 'Paradise Lost.' A long life of persistent earnest labour in the direction towards which the new thought of his day tended, gave Bodmer great influence over the literature of his time. Eight years before Percy's 'Reliques' were published in England, Bodmer had gone back to early German literature, and published, with a glossary and critical remarks, the text of Fables from the Suabian period; following that up at once with a main part of the old German saga of the 'Nibelungenlied' and its sequel the 'Klage.' In his old age he was translating early English ballads. How thoroughly he had then worked himself into the spirit that befits an editor of early texts is to be seen in a letter of his, written in the last year of his life, to Oberlin at Strasburg. The old man of eighty-five expresses reverence for a friend who had got him a valuable codex from the Royal Library, and MSS. of Cuonzen's 'Troja' and 'Freygedank' from the Johanniterhaus. Of 'Freygedank,' he says, Breitinger had made him a clean copy, and he was busy on a transcript of the MS. of 'Priamus:'—

'One of my wishes also is that Von Gravenberg's "Wigoleis" should get into print. A conventual of the Abbey of Einsiedeln has very lately dug up ten pages in quarto on parchments which have served for covers of missal and choir books. I see from these fragments that there are developments in this poem of which many of our clever men would have no reason to be ashamed. I have received Veldeck's "Æneas" from the Ducal Library of Gotha, and have made free extracts from it. . . . I cannot forbear communicating to you my delight at having the parchment codex of the Magliabecchi Library upon my desk—the Grand Duke has had the kindness to entrust it to me. It contains the two great and praised romances, the "Tristan" of Gottfried von Strasburg, and "Laudine"

by Hartman von der Aue. If we could bring out Cuonrad of Würzburg's romance of "Troja" we should have rescued the best.'

The most enthusiastic and the youngest of the editors who have laboured to produce for us our lengthening row of Early English texts cannot be fresher and more eager for his work than this old man of eighty-five was, with the hand of death upon his shoulder.

So began the new study of old literature, in Germany as in England, about a hundred years ago, with the strengthening sense of nationality that caused Teutonic races to revolt from Latin law. Even France, whose critic rule exercised over her own literature none of the blind tyranny that was inseparable from its servile acceptance among nations of another race, even France began at the same time to fasten with new relish upon the works of her most ancient poets. The vivid life of the twelfth century had poured itself out in King Arthur Romances, in the Nibelungenlied, in the Romance of the Cid Campeador, all bred in the days when Henry II. was in England maintaining independence of the civil power against priestly appetite for rule, and when elsewhere the active spirit of freedom had bred a new energy of thought. Upon such literature the revived sense of nationality fastened in Germany with an especial energy. The Nibelungenlied, worked upon at once, as we have said, by Bodmer, has had an army of interpreters, notable among whom are W. Grimm, Gervinus, and Karl Lachmann. It has been translated also into modern German by Rebenstock, Hinsberg, Zeune, Döring, Marbach, and others, besides Simrock, whose version is the one most widely read. Our purpose is not to tell the history of this movement in European literature, but to show how it arose, and how essential a part of the life of our own day, in and out of England, is the stir of thought leading to such efforts as those of the Early English Text Society. For there is a natural history of literature, and every movement has a place of its own in the literary Cosmos.

But if we cannot glance at the new movement in Germany without mentioning the brothers Grimm, so neither can we speak of them without remembering that they marked the temper of their relish for the old national literature by active protests against political tyranny. Within a year of the same age, Ludwig being born in 1785, Wilhelm in 1786, they both studied at Marburg, and both were professors at Göttingen, where they were deprived for joining in the protest signed by seven professors against the abolition of the constitution by the King of Hanover in 1837. They lived together afterwards at Cassel, they went together to Berlin, and they gave the unre-

mitting labour of two kindred minds to the strengthening of the foundations of German nationality by bringing the new generation into sympathy with the old German mind. Ludwig, thoroughly Teutonic, regretted that the Germans should at any time have been subject to Roman civilisation. In his grammar he studied all the details of old German idiom and dialect. He produced a dictionary; wrote of the history of the language, of old German customs, of old German mythology; edited old sagas, romances, hymns, and household stories, aided in some books by his brother as joint editor, in others by his brother's constant energy in the diffusion of the new faith by republication of old texts. Their influence was active throughout Europe. Even in Spain the clever lady who takes her place in literature there as Fernan Caballero, ascribed to an impulse received from a book of Ludwig Grimm's the plan of her valuable collection of the popular tales and poems of Andalusia. Almost as distinctly may the spur of the new German and French national scholarship be found impelling Duran, Depping, and Ferdinand Wolf to their studies of the national songs of Spain, Manuel Milá y Fontanals to his work on the Troubadours, and animating an enthusiastic Spaniard, Don José Amador de los Rios, to the production of a national history of Spanish literature, which in the fourth of its ample volumes has reached only to the middle of the fourteenth century.

Everywhere this close and careful study of old national literature coincides with a revived sense of nationality. It is a hundred years old, and has steadily been growing in exactness. Uhland, Ferdinand Wolf, Adolf Ebert, Ludwig Erk, Karl Bartsch, Ludwig Lemcke, F. E. C. Dietrich, and dozens more, have been working indefatigably in their own national field; Grundtvig and Geijer have been busy upon the early poetry of Danes and Swedes; the old national songs of Portugal have been collected by Almeida-Garrett and the Servian by Vuk Stefanovic.

In France the new movement began in the middle of the last century, when La Curne de Saint-Palaye made his glossary from texts of old French MSS. The comprehensive Literary History of France, founded by Dom Antoine Rivet, was begun by the Benedictines of St. Maur as early as the year 1733. The discourse on the state of letters in France in the twelfth century was published in 1750, but in 1763 the work was voluntarily suspended. The classicists disdained the study of a literature they considered rude, but the reading of the old MSS. and the accumulation of printed texts and extracts was persisted in. Raynouard first looked for a system in the language of the authors of the twelfth and thirteenth century.

Barbazan, Méon, Roquefort, were careless editors, but they were pioneers with virgin soil to till. Barbazan's collection of old Fabliaux and Tales was published in 1756. Méon enlarged and re-edited it in 1808, five years before publishing his edition of the 'Roman de la Rose.' It was in 1808 also that Roquefort, revising and completing the work of Sainte-Palaye, published his 'Glossary of the Romance Language,' which he personally presented to the great Napoleon. 'Romance lan-'guage! What's that?' asked the great man. 'Sire, it is 'the language spoken by our ancestors.' 'Ah! you have 'dedicated this book to my brother Joseph?' 'Yes, sire.' 'Very well. What is your name?' 'Roquefort.' 'What 'are you?' 'Man of letters.' 'Nothing but that?' said the man of battles, and he turned his back upon the scholar. To the school of Méon and Roquefort, Fauriel belonged, but he survived to be an honoured fellow-labourer with men of a later generation. Francisque Michel, Ampère, Paulin Paris, the late Gustave Fallot, and Baron Abel de Chevallet have carried on the work; and now there is on the same ground, scientific high-farming by scholars who have taken hints as to the best way of cultivation from men like d'Orell of Zurich and Diez of Bonn. In France, Edelstand du Méril was the first to recognise their labours, and he was followed by scholars of the mark of Paul Meyer, Gaston Paris, who has produced lately a valuable 'Histoire Poétique de Charlemagne,' F. Guessard, and, more powerful than any of these, Emile Littré, by whom scattered results of labour have been systematised. Since the death of Fauriel, the old literature of the South of France has been less studied, that of the North proving more attractive. But it is not long since the Provençal Grammars produced in the thirteenth century by Hugues Faidit and Raymond Vidal de Besaudun were edited by F. Guessard, Paul Meyer has lately edited the Provençal 'Roman 'de Flamenca,' also of the thirteenth century, and Camille Arnaud the 'Ludus St. Jacobi,' a Provençal mystery. Every important province in France has had special illustration of its literary history. Prosper Tarbé has edited the poets of Champagne; A. Dinaud has produced, in 1837, 1839, 1843, and 1863, four volumes of the 'Trouvères, Jongleurs, and Minstrels of the 'North of France and of the South of Belgium.' Old French poems have been edited from Venetian MSS. by A. Mussafia, who published at Vienna in 1864 'La Prise de Pampelune' and 'Macaire,' while Professor Hippeau of Caen edits a general collection of Old French Literature, the Minister of Public Instruction countenances an Elzevir series of 'Old Poets of

'France,' and so the work goes on which is here but slightly indicated by a few random citations that suggest its character. Keen eyes are ready to detect the treasures hitherto concealed in the provincial libraries. M. Luzarche had only been asked to catalogue the town library of Tours, when he detected in a volume labelled 'Prières' one of the oldest of French miracle plays, an instructive illustration of the miracle play in the transition state, acted neither in the church nor out of the church, but upon scaffolds built over the steps of the church porch, with the inside of the church for the heaven out of which God comes to Paradise.

In France also, as elsewhere, these new studies are visibly connected with the free thought of the time. No student of old French is more conspicuous than M. Littré, whose new French dictionary, result of the labour of twenty years, is a marvel of industry and learning. It is little to say that it supersedes the last edition of the Academy's dictionary of usage, published in 1835. Not only does it give for every word its pronunciation, its grammatical specification, and present actual senses classified and illustrated, but in adding the history of every word from the 11th or 12th to the 16th century, with the requisite sequence of examples, it has done with a compact fulness and precision all the work of the more diffuse historical dictionary which is being edited for the Academy by M. Patin. It is, in short, the best dictionary ever made for a modern language by the labour of a single scholar. But M. Littré belongs heart and soul to our century. He was born in the first year of it. From boyhood an eager and successful student —his friend M. St. Beuve says that in his last year of attendance on classes he took as prizes more than a hundred volumes —prosecuting for eight years the study of medicine beyond any professional requirements, and applying his knowledge as a man of letters to the translating and editing of Hippocrates, working habitually, it is said, with books and pen for eight or nine hours after the time when most people account their day's work over—M. Littré has been a student of the old French national literature with a keen free interest in all the new thought of his time. He is equally, or perhaps still better known, as a champion of the most advanced liberal opinions, in politics, philosophy, and religion; but it is to be regretted that the first literary body in Europe, the French Academy, should have allowed his want of orthodoxy to exclude so eminent a scholar and so blameless a man from the chair to which his marvellous learning clearly entitles him.

It was M. Littré who replaced Fauriel in the commission of

the Benedictines' Literary History of France. This work had been resumed when the revived study of old national literature increased the interest in such details as it accumulated. Edited by a committee of the Institut, it opened the thirteenth century in 1824 with an introduction by Daunou, and in 1862 its twenty-fourth volume contained the general introduction to the fourteenth century, being an account of the state of letters in France in the fourteenth century, upon which its author, M. Victor le Clerc, said that he had been at work since 1842. M. le Clerc is now editor in chief of this series of systematised essays on French literature, his colleagues being Paulin Paris, Emile Littré, and Ernest Renan.

Now, if we are to do as much to regain acquaintance with the genius of our own forefathers as our neighbours are doing in France, Germany, or elsewhere, we must do our work ourselves. Much as we owe to Kemble and Thorpe for promoting the study among us of our oldest literature and for advancing Anglo-Saxon scholarship beyond the range accessible to Sharon Turner, they have had but few abettors. The Danes and Germans, who are much more generally and heartily interested in such labours, edit Anglo-Saxon books more frequently and publish them more cheaply. Germany has been, in fact, annexing the domain of Anglo-Saxon. It is a disgrace to us that Germany not England should have borne testimony to an extended cultivation of our ancient literature by publishing cheaply such a comprehensive body of it as Grein's 'Angel-Sächsische Bibliothek.' Yet we were early in the field. The revival of independent thought at the Reformation brought, in the sixteenth century, Anglo-Saxon scholarship into some honour and request, and a new impulse was given to it by Somner's Anglo-Saxon dictionary, which was produced during the Commonwealth.

If we look to the French for help we find the patriotism of their national scholarship inciting them to attempt no less a work than the annexation of Chaucer. Partly from inability to understand a poet so essentially English, partly perhaps from grudge to England of a fourteenth-century poet whose fame overtops all the crowd of their fourteenth-century notabilities, as Strasburg spire overtops all houses in Strasburg, there is an amusing vein of detraction in French comments upon Chaucer. M. Sandras has written a book to show him up as 'Imitateur des Trouvères,' and M. le Clerc, in his introduction to the fourteenth-century literature of France, is kind enough to tell us incidentally that Chaucer 'has all the faults 'of the trouvères, wants order, proportion, harmonious combi-

'nation of parts of a story; while even his style, not wanting 'in force and cleverness, abounds like that of his masters in 'negligences and trivialities.' But he has at least the candour to add: 'Chaucer's advantage is that he has been always read 'and understood by a great number of his countrymen, while 'our old poets have had to suffer such an oblivion that foreign 'imitators have received the honours due to their inventions.' Here is an odd blinking of the reason why Chaucer, in spite of the old rust upon his language, 'has been always read and un-'derstood by a great number of his countrymen.' What France produced was a Froissart when England produced a Chaucer. We are so far from being generally in advance of the French as readers and understanders of our early literature, that the scholarly cultivation of it hitherto has been almost impossible without such aids as the national scholarship of France and Germany did not require for their developement.

Our literary book-clubs have been necessary compensations for the backwardness of English scholarship among the English people and the total want of patronage bestowed upon it by the Universities and the Government until very recently. The Roxburghe Club, instituted in 1812, produced its first volume (Surrey's Translations from the Æneid) in 1814. Of that volume sixty copies were printed, but so large an impression was not taken of another of its books for the next fourteen years. Sometimes the impression was limited to a volume for each of the thirty-one original members, with an extra volume upon vellum. Often there were thirty-four or thirty-five copies printed, or some number between thirty-four and fifty, although many of the books of this club have been of the highest literary value. The Bannatyne Club, founded at Edinburgh in 1823, printed usually from sixty to a hundred copies of each piece of the old national literature; and there was about the same limit to the impression of books published by the Maitland Club, instituted at Glasgow in 1828. The Surtees Society, founded at Durham in 1834, with a larger number of members, charged itself with the printing of valuable chronicles and records illustrating local history. The Abbotsford Club, founded at Edinburgh in 1835, published in its time very limited impressions of some valuable works.

Of these societies the first was named after John Duke of Roxburghe, a native of Bristol, who spent most of his fortune upon the collection of rare books. His library was sold in London in the year 1812, the year after his death, and it was in London that the club named after him presently originated. But the continuation of the movement by formation of new

publishing clubs was confined to Scotland and the north of England, until the formation in 1838 of the Camden Society, 'to perpetuate and render accessible whatever is valuable but 'at present little known amongst the materials for the civil, 'ecclesiastical, or literary history of the United Kingdom.' Having that object, it fitly took its name from the Elizabethan historian and topographer of Britain. The Historical Society, founded in the same year, printed texts of old chronicles. In the following year, 1839, there was established at Aberdeen the Spalding Club, for the printing of the historical, ecclesiastical, genealogical, topographical, and literary remains connected with the north-eastern counties of Scotland. In the next year, 1840, four important publishing clubs were founded, namely, the Irish Archæological Society, the Parker, the Percy, and the Shakespeare Societies. In 1843 the Chetham Society was formed at Manchester for publication of historical and literary remains connected with the palatine counties of Lancaster and Chester. The Hakluyt Society, founded in 1846, has published a most interesting series of records of early voyages and travels. In 1853 the Philobiblon Society began to form its choice miscellanies, rich in literary matter of great interest, which is confined to a small circle of readers. Hitherto we have been indebted almost exclusively to the zeal and scholarship of members of such societies as these for the means of studying the early history and literature of our own country. The Society of Antiquaries published Mr. Thorpe's edition of 'Cædmon,' and Sir Frederic Madden's 'Layamon.' The Bannatyne Club published Sir F. Madden's 'Sir Gawayne,' which, like his 'Layamon,' has an introduction that no student of English can afford to leave unread. The Percy Society printed the 'Owl and Nightingale.' The 'Ancren Riwle,' that forms also an essential part of early English study, was published by the Camden Society; and so were the works of Walter Map, the man of greatest genius in the time of Henry II. The Roxburghe Club was publisher of 'Gower's 'Balades,' and of his 'Vox Clamantis.' The Shakespeare Society published the 'Chester' and 'Coventry' Mysteries. The 'Towneley Mysteries' were printed by the Surtees Society. These are but a few slight suggestions of the substantial quality of the service done while yet there was no public to pay a trader for the issue of such works. In 1857 the Master of the Rolls submitted to the Treasury his plan, which was at once adopted, for the publication of that series of 'Chronicles 'and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the 'Middle Ages,' which is now, and will continue to be for

many years, in course of publication. This series already includes thoroughly edited texts of forty-four distinct works formerly unprinted or almost inaccessible, in sixty-six handsome volumes, which are sold to all comers at little more than half the price a publisher would charge for them in the usual course of trade.

The aim of the last established of the book societies appears to be to work in the same spirit for the diffusion of interest in early English literature, and to hasten the coming time when there will be for such literature an English public large enough to encourage business-men to look for their own profit in its dissemination. The Early English Text Society sets no limit to the number of its members or of copies of its books. Its editors give their labour, as in the Camden and some other clubs. There is no paid staff; there is no rent to pay; and, the books being issued in paper covers, there is not even a drawback in the cost of binding. The whole subscription is spent upon the simple printing and distributing of its usually well-edited texts, in good type, upon good paper, in octavo form, each with its glossary and introduction.

The Society was founded in 1864, and was suggested by the desire to continue and extend an issue of Early Texts which had been begun by the Philological Society. That Society had issued five texts, including Mr. Furnivall's 'Early Lives of Saints,' and Mr. Richard Morris's edition of Hampole's 'Pricke of Conscience,' valuable not only on its own account, but for the careful analysis of the old Northern dialect given by Mr. Morris in the introduction. The new Society, then, was constituted in 1864, with Mr. Furnivall and Mr. Morris among its ablest and most active members, and declared its purpose to be the publication of a series of Early English Texts, especially those relating to King Arthur. A vast mass of our early literature, it said truly enough, was, in spite of the efforts of the Percy, Camden, and other Societies, still unprinted, and more than half our early printed literature, including the Arthur romances, was still inaccessible to the student of moderate means.

The publications of the Society consist of works printed for the first time from the manuscript, or re-edited from the MSS. from which they were originally printed, or from earlier MSS. where such were known to exist; and the plan does not exclude reprints of scarce printed books, of which the MSS. are not now in existence. The subscription is one guinea a year, and already a large number of these curious and valuable works may be obtained for a few shillings. The day is, indeed, yet

distant enough when it shall be said of our railway stalls as Erasmus said of the English monasteries, 'Mirum est dictu, 'quam hic passim, quam dense, veterum librorum seges effo-'rescat.' But it will not be the fault of the Early English Text Society if that cannot be said in a few years of the homes of educated English readers.

The zeal, too, is well spent that looks to such an end. Not only have we been following for the last half century in the path to which the Bodmers and the Percys pointed, and sought new strength for our literature by making it more distinctly English in its form and substance, but of late years we have been recognising, as we never before recognised, in our schools and colleges, the value of a close study of our own language and literature. By the current of opinion, and by the tests applied at civil service and other examinations, the young Englishman is now almost compelled to attempt some systematic study of the speech and thought of his country. He cannot study the language without reference to Early English Texts, and the best of these have hitherto been costly and almost inaccessible. Of many that he may expect an examiner to question him about, he must be content to take what he knows from the description given by his teacher, which is a way of acquiring little but the art of seeming to be well informed. The cheap distribution of good texts of Early English writers has become, therefore, a necessary supplement to the new movement towards greater thoroughness in English education; and it is an essential part of the scheme of the Early English Text Society to labour to the utmost for their cheap and wide diffusion. A small subscription now enables every school in which English is studied to have in its library a free supply of the requisite materials for an English education that does not consist merely of cramming. The difficulty of reading Early English is but slight, and the process of mastering it is pleasant; for it throws light upon many interesting points in language and dialect, and puts new mind into many a word and phrase. No student of English has been thoroughly taught who cannot read a fourteenth century romance for his own pleasure without finding old forms of language an impediment to the enjoyment of its story, and fair apprehension of the way of telling it. The only reason why even good students usually fail to acquire such a power is that they find difficulty in getting the material on which to exercise it. Meanwhile, as the quick success of this Society has shown, the want of the material is duly felt, and the number of educated Englishmen who are now ready to take pleasant rambles about the sources

of our literature must be large enough to strengthen very considerably the new Society's efficiency when once the public fairly knows what it is doing.

The first announcement of its object was very brief and general; but, as its work proceeded, it fell into distinct groups; and at the beginning of last year they were thus defined: 'Starting with a resolve to print the whole of the Early 'English romances relating to Arthur and his Knights, the 'committee next resolved to illustrate the dialects, and the 'increase in the vocabulary of the English tongue. To these 'groups was necessarily added a third, or miscellaneous one; 'and during 1865 the committee felt it right to commence a 'Biblical and Religious group, seeing how large a portion of 'our early literature was occupied with such topics.' The grouping simply indicates a catholicity of taste, with a determination to try for a complete set of the old English Arthur romances, to represent also the strength of the religious element in this as in every other period of English literature, and to furnish all possible aid to an exact study of the language.

The oldest of the series, for the present, is coeval with the 'Ancren Riwle,' a rule of counsel and instruction, written in semi-Saxon for a small society of three anchoresses, with their maid-servants or lay sisters, who had a house near Crayford Bridge, in Dorsetshire. The 'Ancren Riwle,' first edited for the Camden Society in 1853, has become an important text-book for the student of our language as it was spoken in the beginning of the thirteenth century. Mr. Cockayne contributes to the series before us two more books of the same period, adding even a suggestion—made on very insufficient grounds—that the author of the 'Ancren Riwle,' probably Richard Poor, successively bishop of Chichester, Salisbury, and Durham, was the author of these pieces also. One of them is a metrical life of 'St. Margaret, Maiden and Martyr;' the other, a treatise upon 'Holy Maidenhood.'

The legend of St. Margaret, which has appeared this year, is a re-issue by the Society of a book published by Mr. Cockayne, as a venture of his own, in 1862. It adds a shorter version of the legend from a Harleian MS., and another from Hickes, to the main text, which is of 'Seinte Marherete the Meiden ant 'Martyr,' from a small quarto vellum volume (MS. Reg. 17. A. xxvij.), into which there was transcribed—as Sir F. Madden believes, about A.D. 1230—not only this legend, but also the lives of St. Catherine and of St. Juliana. The St. Catherine was printed for the Abbotsford Club in 1841, but is not to

be bought, and will therefore, as well as the St. Juliana, be supplied by Mr. Cockayne to this cheap and accessible series of Early English Texts.

Mr. Cockayne does his work with a hearty and somewhat eccentric enthusiasm that even leads him to attempt, in his own writing, the revival of the letters used by our forefathers for the sharp and flat sounds of *th* in thin and then. No doubt þ and ð are as fit parts of our English alphabet, and stand for as distinct letters as *p* and *b*, *k* and *g*, *f* and *v*; but as written signs they have had their fall, and all the king's printers cannot set them up again. All that Mr. Cockayne can effect he does effect—namely, the mystification of his readers by opposing modern practice in making ð the sign of the sharp sound, and þ of the flat. Thus with 'þohtes' in his texts he will write 'ðoughts' in his modern version. It is true that Hickes and others, following Spelman, defined the pronunciation in the way still followed by Mr. Cockayne. But in following Spelman they adopted an error on behalf of which no argument whatever was adduced, and which Erasmus Rask, in his Anglo-Saxon grammar, translated by Mr. Benjamin Thorpe, gave good reason for correcting. The correction has been accepted in later text-books, and Mr. Cockayne can only produce bewilderment by expressing practically his dissent in application of the signs to modern English, the rather as he makes mysterious exceptions to his own practice. Why, for example, does he write, as in the 'Foreword' to the 'Holy 'Maidenhood,' 'þirteenþ?' Mr. Cockayne has also his eccentricities of interpretation. In 'St. Margaret' he explains a passage that speaks of the Lord whom the Jews 'fordemden' as 'for-doomed (*wrongly doomed*).' For-doomed is, as the Germans say, 'verdammt,' rightly or wrongly as the case may be. In the very same piece the fiend of lust under St. Margaret's heel says to the unconquerable virgin of himself and his like, 'Beatest us ant bindest, ant to deathe fordemest,' where Mr. Cockayne simply repeats in his version 'to death 'for-deemest.' Did this mean that by the power of pure maidenhood the devils of lust were 'wrongly doomed' to death? Again, Mr. Cockayne translates 'Ne forlet tu me 'nawt, luuende lauerd, bihald me ant help me,' in this way, 'Ne for-let (*let go to ruin*) thou me not, loving lord; behold 'me and help me.' Anybody else would have been content to translate this 'Forsake me not;' as again, too, the Germans say, 'Verlass mich nicht.' But we are in no humour for picking holes. Mr. Cockayne has here edited, genially and as thoroughly as he could, two very good typical specimens of

semi-Saxon, and as books they are amusing. St. Margaret's endurance of whippings and burnings, and her triumphant dealing with the two infernal monsters in her prison, of whom the first comer actually swallows her, but she disagrees with him so much that he bursts in two to let her out again, is in fine earnest mediæval style and very edifying; while the homily on Holy Maidenhood paints in the liveliest way for the warning of young maids the miseries of matrimony. Let them think, it asks, 'how the wife stands that hears, when she comes in, 'her child scream, sees the cat at the flitch, and the dog at the 'hearth; her cake is burning on the stone, and her calf sucking, 'the pot boils over into the fire, and the churl (her husband) 'chides her.' Mr. Cockayne, we see, in his version of this scrap of warning, translates the dog at the hearth into a 'hound at the hide,' and says 'the churl is scolding,' without giving the unskilled reader a hint that 'ceorl' had husband for its secondary meaning. The translation of 'hearth' into 'hide' was a half-pardonable blunder, the word in the text being huide; and although hude is a well-known Anglo-Saxon synonym for heorð, húd or hýd means a hide. But the 'dog at the hide' is nonsense; while the hearth, where the cake is on the stone and the meat in the pot, is obviously the place to be protected from the forays of the dog.

The place assigned to marriage in these pieces is not one of complete dishonour. The author of the 'Hali Meidenhad' compares wedlock to a bed for the sick, and says that the song in heaven of the married folks is to thank God that when they fell from the height Maidenhood they had a bed to fall upon, so that they got no more hurt than they could heal with almsdeed, 'for whosoever fall out of the grace of maidenhood so 'that the woven bed of wedlock take them not, drive down to 'the earth so terribly that they are dashed to pieces, joint and 'muscle.' He gives also an arithmetical scale of the degrees of heavenly bliss that answer to the degrees on earth of maidenhood, widowhood, and wedlock. 'Wedlock,' he says, 'has its fruit thirty fold in heaven, widowhood sixty fold; 'maidenhood with a hundred fold overpasses both. Consider 'then, hereby, whosoever from her maidenhood descendeth 'into wedlock, by how many degrees she falleth downward. 'She is a hundred degrees elevated towards heaven while she 'holds to maidenhood, as the reward proveth; and she leapeth 'into wedlock, that is, downward to the thirtieth, over three 'twenties and yet more by ten.'

The next in date of the works hitherto edited by this Text Society is the early English romance of 'King Horn,' from a

complete copy in the Cambridge University Library. The MS. is of the second half of the thirteenth century, and is the same from which the English version of 'King Horn' was printed by the Bannatyne Club to accompany M. Michel's edition of the later French romance. There was no glossary, and the English text printed in Paris contained many misprints. The Text Society therefore re-edits it, with a good glossarial index, and joins with it a fragment of 'Floriz and 'Blanchefleur,' and a fragment of a poem on the 'Assumption,' which, standing before and after it in the Cambridge MS., have suffered losses of first and last leaves from which they have protected the romance that lay between them. These fragments are judiciously combined with another fragment of 'Floriz and Blanchefleur' from one of the Cotton MSS. much damaged by the fire, and with a complete version from a later MS. of the poem upon the 'Assumption of Our 'Lady.'

'King Horn' is a romance of our own, ascribed by M. Francisque Michel to a Dano-Saxon cycle of romances, of which the only two considerable remains are this 'King Horn' and the romance of 'Havelok.' The value of 'King Horn' in a collection of texts is obvious enough, though it is a romance in every way of less interest than 'Havelok,' which was edited by Sir F. Madden for the Roxburghe Club in 1828; the English version, written towards the close of the thirteenth century, having been discovered by him in a MS. book labelled 'Vitæ Sanctorum,' among the Laudian collection in the Bodleian Library. It would be a boon to students if the Early English Text Society could give them 'Havelok' in a cheap volume. That and 'King Horn' would complete the furnishing of one little corner in its shrine of early English fancy, wit, and wisdom. The Society would, we believe, have included 'Havelok' among the publications of its second year, if Sir Frederic Madden, its first editor, had not desired himself to produce a new edition, either for the Camden Society or as a separate work. This would secure to it the best editing; but unless the new edition is to be a cheap one, might it not be well to have also from this Society a half crown or three shilling copy of the text of a work with which every student of our Early English literature must wish to become familiar? Meanwhile we have 'King Horn,' and with it the two other pieces we have named. To Oriental fancy the romance of 'Floriz and Blanchefleur,' which seems to have come through Spain into Europe, owes much of its beauty. It is a poetical tale, of which the charm was felt by Boccaccio, who began

with it his career in literature by making it the foundation of his 'Filocopo;' the Italian prose romance, written by him before the 'Teseide' with which he taught Italians the value to them of *ottava rima* for the telling of an epic or heroic tale.

While there are such points of literary interest to sharpen our attention to Mr. Lumby's edition of 'King Horn' and his fragments of 'Floriz and Blanchefleur,' the story of 'The 'Assumption of Our Lady,' which he gives complete in the same volume, acquires interest, as he himself says, by the recent publication of three Syriac versions (two fragmentary and one complete), of a very early date, by Dr. Wright. The fragments are both printed in his 'Syriac Apocrypha.' Ewald assigns the origin of the story to the latter half of the fourth century, and a similar narrative is said to exist in Æthiopic. The device of this legend is not without some spirit of poetry. The Apostles are drawn in different ways, at the same time, from their different fields of labour, to meet about the dying mother of their Lord, except St. Thomas. After her death they carry her body to burial, protecting it against perils from the Jews; and after they have brought it to the valley of Jehoshaphat, St. Thomas, who has come out of India, joins them. He answers to their rebuke for coming after the rest have already buried their Lady, that she is not in her tomb, for he has seen her in the flesh, and she has given him her girdle. He shows the girdle of silk and gold, which the other disciples knew to have been on the body they took to its burial; and the Apostles, looking in the tomb, see that the Holy Virgin is indeed not there. In her place they find only a little manna. The subject is charmingly treated, if we remember rightly, in one of Perugino's finest paintings now in the gallery of the Vatican.

Glancing rapidly through the publications of the Society in their chronological order, we come next to an Early English song of about the middle of the thirteenth century, now first edited by Mr. Richard Morris from a unique MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It is one of those metrical versions of Bible story which descend in direct line from Cædmon's paraphrase, and which were contrived of old by pious men for the livelier instruction of the common people in the leading facts of Scripture. Before the Conquest such poems supplied the place of the old pagan songs of the gleemen at many a lordly feast or rustic festival, and did much of the work which, after the Conquest, they for a time shared with the Mystery Plays by which they were superseded in the favour of the people. In these sequences of Scripture song, as

in the Mystery Plays, Old Testament story was always told as pointing towards Christ; and so it is with the thirteenth century poem here edited by Mr. Morris, which goes with unusual fulness through Genesis and Exodus, ending its popular version of each book with a prayer for salvation. The versifier evidently meant to go on with the Bible story; but if he wrote no more than remains to us, he produced a very complete and substantial section of it.

Allied to this work in character is the group of three 'Early 'English Alliterative Poems' of the fourteenth century, taken from a MS. in the Cotton collection which also contains the romance of 'Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight.' Of these poems too Mr. Richard Morris is the editor. In the first of them a father lamenting a lost child, his pearl, visits the child's grave, and there dreams that he sees her in bliss on the other side of a stream, which he is told he cannot pass till after death. His glorified child tells him of the bliss of heaven, points out to him the heavenly Jerusalem, is seen by him in a procession of virgins going to salute the Lamb; but he wakes as he attempts to cross the stream and follow her. In the second poem Bible stories enforce purity of life. The third poem, designed to show the nobleness of patience, tells the tale of Jonah. The writer of these pieces was a poet who had eyes of the mind wherewith to see what he described, and much vivacity and force, even occasional grandeur, in the good music of his alliterative verse. He is the author also of that alliterative romance poem of 'Sir Gawayne and the Green 'Knight,' which has been edited by Sir F. Madden for the Bannatyne Club. Sir F. Madden has generously and wisely placed at the disposal of the Early English Text Society any of the texts furnished by him to the more costly book clubs, which it may determine to re-edit, except, as we have said, his first work, 'Havelok.' The Society has, therefore, re-edited 'Sir Gawayne,' by reprinting Sir F. Madden's accurate text and simply comparing it with the original MS., for the effacement of such errors of transcription as might here and there occur. Mr. Morris, who is editor also of this volume, adds the careful glossary without which no book is issued by the Society.

Setting aside 'Sir Gawayne' for the present, we recur to the story of 'Genesis and Exodus' and the 'Alliterative Poems,' for to the introductions to these Mr. Morris has given some of his best study as an interpreter of the different forms taken by our language, on its way from semi-Saxon towards modern English. It is in study of this kind that Mr. Morris's strength

lies, and no living man has done more towards making our knowledge of Early English clear and thorough. There was much need of such a worker. The number is small of those who are able to cultivate this field of knowledge at once with discretion and enthusiasm. Exact study of the language being necessary to a full enjoyment of the literature, it is fortunate that the most active workers in the Early English Text Society are essentially philologists. They may be thought by some readers to lay too much emphasis upon precision in the preservation and analysis of every minute peculiarity. But it is so only that they can smooth the way to a complete appreciation of the texts they publish.

Ralph Higden, describing the England of his own time in the middle of the fourteenth century, said that there were three forms of English speech, Southern, Midland, and Northern. A careful study of books written in different parts of England during the passage of English from its semi-Saxon stage into the language of Shakespeare, shows that there were definite grounds for Higden's division, not merely in pronunciation and in certain differences of vocabulary, but in grammatical forms; and, if differences in grammatical inflexion be regarded as the main test, there is no division to be found so good as that which Higden left on record in his 'Polychronicon.' Mr. Garnett made the number of dialects five, Southern, Western, Mercian, Anglian, and Northumbrian. But Mr. Morris rightly argues, that the additional distinctions should not be accepted, because they are not based upon essential differences of inflexion. The Western English does not essentially differ from the Southern, Robert of Gloucester's 'Chronicle,' and the Kentish 'Ayenbite of Inwit' being obviously mere varieties of the same dialect. Mr. Garnett's Anglian again is only a variety of the Midland. The Early Text Society holds, therefore, by the old division of the language into three dialects—Northern, Midland, and Southern—which are especially distinguished by their way of inflecting the plural of the present indicative. In the Northern it is we *loves*, ye *loves*, they *loves*; in the Midland it is we *loven*, ye *loven*, they *loven*; in the Southern it is we *loveth*, ye *loveth*, they *loveth*, with a second form of we *love*, ye *love*, they *love*. Again, to take only the one distinction that approaches nearest to the furnishing of a test word in the discrimination between subdivisions of each dialect, we have a subdivision of the Northern dialect into that of Northumberland and Yorkshire, that of the Scottish Lowlands, and that of the Border. Of these dialects a good distinctive test is to be found, says Mr. Morris, in the

word for 'such.' *Sic* is such in Lowland Scottish; it is so used now, but was not in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, south of the Tweed. *Slike* (Icelandic, slik = such) was the Border word; and *swilk* (Anglo-Saxon, swilc) was the form usual in Yorkshire and Northumberland. Again, the best single test for subdivision of the Midland dialect is the inflexion not of the plural but of the singular in the indicative present: South and East Midland shared the Southern form, I *love*, thou *lovest*, he *loveth*. West Midland, including Lancashire and Cheshire, had I *love*, thou *loves*, he *loves*; the characteristic Midland plural being in each case *loven*. These are indications of a manner of distinguishing that has been followed through numerous details, and forms a study which soon qualifies for critical appreciation of the language of our early writers.

The 'Three Alliterative Poems,' in the West Midland dialect of the fourteenth century, Mr. Morris has prefaced with a complete analysis of the West Midland dialect and an exceedingly full glossary. The story of 'Genesis' and 'Exodus' is in the East Midland of the middle of the thirteenth century. By the text, glossary, and introductions to these two volumes, the student is helped to a pretty complete mastery of the Early English of the Midland district. The best account of the Northern dialect has also been given by Mr. Morris, and is in the introduction to his edition of Hampole's 'Pricke of Con-'science,' published by the Philological Society in 1863. The student of English who proposes to make good use of the publications of the Early English Text Society will find it advantageous to add Richard of Hampole's Northumbrian poem to the series. The Southern dialect has not yet been illustrated by the new English Text Society. Mr. Edmond Brock has given, perhaps, the best account of it in an analysis of the grammatical forms of the 'Ancren Riwle,' contributed last year to the 'Transactions' of the Philological Society. Mr. Morris is to supply the Text Society with his analysis of Southern English in an introduction to the Kentish 'Ayenbite 'of Inwit' (Remorse of Conscience). We may add that, although Hampole's 'Pricke of Conscience' is not in the series, the deficiency in special means of studying the Northern dialect will be supplied by editions of at least two early specimens, the 'Cursor Mundi' and Richard of Hampole's prose translation of, and comment on, the Psalms from the Eton College MS.

To illustrate the growth of our vocabulary, Mr. H. B. Wheatley, Mr. Fry, and others, have undertaken to edit for this Text Society, a series of early dictionaries, beginning with

'Levins's Manipulus Vocabulorum,' the earliest rhyming dictionary, of which only three copies are known to exist. The greater monuments of early literature are to be treated with proportionate respect.

Of 'The Vision of Piers Plowman,' apart from Chaucer the most important work in Early English, the best three MS. texts are to be separately printed. The first of them, transcribed from the Vernon MS. at Oxford, will be published in 1867; and that it may be clearly ascertained which are the best two of the remaining texts, a comparison is being made by printing from every accessible MS. its version of a test passage containing several verbal plurals, from which might be determined whether any MSS. are consistent in the use of the Southern *th*, the Midland *n*, or the Northern *s* in the present plural indicative. Mr. Skeat, who edits, with an explanation of the plan of the proposed three-text edition, a collection made in this manner from twenty-nine MSS. of the poem, finds necessary and proposes the use also of another text passage. The variations in the text admit, he says, of an arrangement of the MSS. into three groups; namely, those of which the Vernon MS. at Oxford, giving the oldest form, is the best example; 2, those which resemble the text printed by Crowley in 1550, and to this group belongs also the text printed in 1856 by Mr. Wright; and 3, those resembling the text printed by Whitaker, which was not a good one of its class. The three-text edition is designed, therefore, to give the best example of each of these three forms of text. It must be in three separate books, because the extraordinary differences in the arrangement of the subject-matter make parallel columns useless; but copious references will be given to assist comparison, and the faults of omission frequent in these MSS. may, in any case, be covered by insertions of lines taken from other MSS. of the same class. Among the other publications promised, we notice Barbour's 'Brus,' a curious set of MS. treatises on early manners and meals, Robert of Brunne's 'Handlying Synne,' the History of the Holy Graal, Chaucer's Prose works, and, long sorely wanted, Lydgate's works, of which a large and important part has never yet been printed. We are to have also the Midland Psalter, hitherto erroneously described as Southern, of William of Shoreham, besides the Northumbrian version, by Richard Rolle, the monk of Hampole, both produced early in the fourteenth century.'

Richard of Hampole, that Yorkshire hermit prolific of books, is presented under a new light, in one of the last volumes

issued by the Text Society. All his English works are to be given, and here are, in good old Northumbrian English, some short prose treatises of his taken from a miscellaneous collection of poems, tracts, prayers, and medical receipts, made by Robert Thornton, archdeacon of Bedford, in the earlier half of the fifteenth century. Mr. George G. Perry, who is their editor, adds to the information that has hitherto been current about the hermit's life. All that was really known of him has been that, at some time about the beginning of the reign of Edward III. he withdrew himself from the world, and devoted himself to a life of austere meditation in a cell not far from the monastery of Hampole. As he was admitted among the holy confessors of the Church, particulars of him might have been found in the 'Officium de Sancto Heremitâ,' if that work had not been destroyed by the fire in the Cotton Library. But in the library of Lincoln Cathedral is a copy of the 'Officium et Legenda de Vitâ Ricardi Rolle,' long sought but only now first brought to light, and with the English prose treatises of Rolle, just edited by him, Mr. Perry prints the whole of this document, as far as it can be deciphered. From it we learn that Rolle was born at Thornton in the diocese of York, sent to school, and in due time patronised by Thomas Neville, archdeacon of Durham, who sent him to Oxford. There he made great progress in his studies, preferring theology to physics or secular science. At the age of nineteen, mindful of the uncertainty of life, and fearing the temptations to sin, he returned home, and one day told a beloved sister that he had a mighty desire towards two of her gowns, one white the other grey. Would she bring them to him next day in a neighbouring wood, and bring with them a hood their father used in rainy weather? When she did so, he took off his own clothes, put on his sister's white dress next his skin, drew over it the grey dress with its sleeves cut off, thrusting his arms through the armholes, hooded himself with his father's rainhood, and having thus made himself look as much like a hermit as he could, ran away, while his sister cried, 'My brother is mad! My brother is mad!' He went then, so dressed, on the vigil of the Assumption, into a church, and placed himself where the wife of a Sir John de Dalton used to pray. When Lady de Dalton came with her servants, she would not allow them to disturb the pious young man at his prayers. Her sons, who had studied in Oxford, told her who he was. Next day he assumed, unbidden, the dress of an assistant, and joined in the singing of the service; after which, having obtained the benediction of the priest, he

mounted the pulpit, and preached such a sermon that many, who wept over it, said they had never heard the like before. After mass, Sir John de Dalton invited him to dinner; but he went, because of humility, into a poor old house at the gate of the manor, till he was urged by the knight's own sons to the dinner table. During dinner he maintained a profound silence, but after dinner, Sir John, having talked with him privately, was satisfied of his sanity; he therefore furnished the enthusiast with such hermit's dress as he wished for, gave him a cell to live in, and provided for his daily sustenance.

So runs the story now first printed by Mr. Perry. The Hermit of Hampole, thus set up in his chosen vocation, became almost the busiest religious writer of his day, and well deserves his place in the good company to which the Early English Text Society is introducing its subscribers.

Then we have a substantial book of the fifteenth century—'Political, Religious, and Love Poems,' mainly drawn from a MS. in the library of Lambeth Palace, but partly also from MSS. in the Cotton collection at the British Museum, from the Cambridge University library, and from some other sources. The volume is a singularly entertaining miscellany, not the less valuable for reprinting, from the MSS. at hand, several good pieces that have appeared already in volumes not very easily accessible. Upon one piece in this volume, 'The 'Stacyons of Rome,' giving account of the spiritual graces obtained by the pious at the shrines of Rome, Mr. W. M. Rossetti supplies annotations. The advantages of journeying to Rome were, in this poem, shown to be great. Thus, when the Veronica was shown, residents in the city were to get four thousand years' pardon, outsiders nine thousand years, and persons coming from beyond the sea twelve thousand years. It was well to be a pilgrim to Rome upon terms like these. In the same volume we find, gathered by a genial and skilful editor, grave and gay, tales, prayers, love songs, fables, proverbs, political squibs, posies, even pieces that resemble nothing so much as short nursery jingles. The occasional introduction of a miscellany like this into the series of publications, the pieces being mostly of the same century, will add not less to the completeness than to the vivacity of a collection which is no dry mass of antiquarianism, but a bright representation of the earnest thought, the wit and fancy of our forefathers, four, five, six, and seven hundred years ago.

Six of the volumes already published by the Society constitute the beginning of the King Arthur library that it proposes to produce. One of them is the romance of 'Sir Gawayne and

'the Grene Knight' in alliterative verse, by the author of the religious poems, also in alliterative verse, which have been edited by Mr. Morris. This author, thoroughly religious, finds in Sir Gawayne, nephew to King Arthur, a hero whom he describes as faultless in his five wits, putting trust in the five wounds, and most distinguished among men in the five virtues that mark the true knight. The Green Knight came, as a green monster riding a green foal, to Arthur's court on New Year's Day, to try the temper of its champions. He would abide one stroke from any of the knights upon condition that, next New Year's Day, that knight should come and abide, in turn, a stroke from him. Gawayne accepted the challenge and struck off the head of the Green Knight, who then picked his head up, turned it towards Guenevere, spoke through it, bidding Gawayne look for him at the green chapel, and rode out at the hall door with his head still in his hand. Gawayne honourably fulfilled his pledge, and by resisting the enticements of his host's wife, escaped with his life, getting only a scratch on his neck for a slight failure of faith, and bringing home a magical green girdle. His return with such a trophy caused the Knights of the Round Table ever after to wear a bright green belt for Gawayne's sake.

Two other books of the series have Arthur himself for hero. One gives, in six or seven hundred lines, an abstract, with omissions, of Geoffrey of Monmouth's narrative; and it is taken by Mr. Furnivall, its editor, from an incomplete Latin chronicle of the kings of Britain bound up with other pieces in a MS. belonging to the Marquis of Bath. The other is a version edited by Mr. Perry, of the 'Morte Arthure,' printed from a thick MS. volume known as the 'Thornton Romances' in the library of Lincoln Cathedral. The greater part of this volume was written by Robert Thornton, a native of Oswaldkirk in Yorkshire, who was archdeacon of Bedford about the middle of the fifteenth century. The short metrical sketch of Arthur, edited by Mr. Furnivall, is of the same period, but of course is a much less important work than the 'Morte Arthure' from Archdeacon Thornton's valuable MS. This was first printed by Mr. Halliwell in 1847, but Mr. Halliwell's issue being limited to seventy-five costly copies, the work is practically inaccessible to the general reader, and is now, therefore, republished by the Early English Text Society, with a few changes in the form of editing, frequent collations with the MS., and the addition of side notes and a glossary. This poem is written with great animation, and has one passage, on scenery, that is among the gems of Early English literature.

The Society is also publishing, from the unique MS. in the library of Cambridge University, the prose 'Romance of 'Merlin,' which, in the two parts already published, extends over 378 well-filled pages, and of which a third part has yet to appear. To the first part, Mr. D. N. Nash has prefixed a remarkable essay showing how three different characters—the Ambrosius of Nennius, the Ambrosius Aurelianus who conquered Vortigern, and the Cymric bard Merddhin, have been confounded together in the Merlin of romance. The Society's prose romance is of about the middle of the fifteenth century, and to the end of the century belongs the Scottish national romance of 'Lancelot of the Laik,' which also forms part of the little library already issued by the Text Society. This was carelessly edited for the Maitland Club in 1839, from a MS. in the Cambridge University library, and is now carefully re-edited by Mr. Skeat. The poem is, as he says, loose paraphrase and amplification of part of the first of the three volumes of the French romance of 'Lancelot du Lac.'

The remarkable development of the King Arthur legends into a great cycle of romance will be amply illustrated as the Text Society proceeds with the fulfilment of its purpose. M. de la Villemarqué, an accomplished Breton, has assisted English studies by the careful research he has made into Breton sources of King Arthur legend during his labour of collecting the songs, ballads, and traditions of his people; and the value of his local studies is not the less for his over-estimate of the antiquity of Welsh Triads and other Cymric traditions which belong rather to the end than to the beginning of the Welsh literary epoch. On this side of the Channel we find that the fragments of old Cymric literature, with the least questionable marks of antiquity, have for their central figure not Arthur, but Urien, the patriot chief who led the Cymry of the Scottish Lowlands, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and North Lancashire, in their struggle against the force of Ida and the invading colonists who founded Anglian Northumbria. 'May I never smile,' said Taliesin, 'if I praise not 'Urien.' Llywarch Hen, the best of the old bards, sings of Urien's death, and of his head that he carried from the battlefield:—

'I carry by my side the head of Urien. . . . The head that I carry carried me; I shall find it no more; it will come no more to my succour. Woe to my hand, my happiness is lost! The head that I bear from the slope of Pennok has its mouth foaming with blood; woe to Rheged from this day! My arm is not weaker, but my rest is troubled; my heart, will you not break? The head that I carry carried me.'

The long fragment of Aneurin's Gododin tells the close of the same struggle in a six-day fight at Catterick Bridge in Yorkshire, when the Cymric chiefs from Wigtown, Kirkcudbright and Ayr, and from the shores of Clyde, crossing the Solway, went up the river Eden, or marching by land through Strathclyde, met at the gathering-place in Cumberland in answer to the call of Mynnidawg, the lord of Eiddin, district of the river Eden, and marched down through Swaledale to the shock of war. They went to battle with the Angles for recovery of some part of the land of the Ododin (Otadini of the Romans), who correspond in geographical position to the men of Deivyr and Bryneich (Durham and Northumberland). When Urien and the native chiefs who followed him maintained this losing struggle in the North, the stir of noble energies gave life to song. At the same time Arthur was fighting his unequal battle in the South. Llywarch began his career as soldier-bard in Arthur's army, and sings of the death of his friend and patron Geraint, the son of Erbin, in a bloody battle with the Saxons. But Llywarch, too, was drawn from the South to join the rally around Urien. If we look, in fact, to the oldest Cymric tradition, it is Urien rather than Arthur whom they represent as the delight of bards. But in the French Arthur romances, Urien has faded into the dim shape of a Sir Urience of Gore.

The truth appears to be that the Cymry in the sixth century were fighting in the South and North of England with an equal courage for possessions in the plains, and South and North were driven to the hills by the incoming sword and plough. The greatest of the Northern chiefs was Urien; the greatest of the Southern chiefs was Arthur. The kindred people of Brittany, by participation and report, knew much of that part of the wide struggle which was next to them. But of Urien faint news came from afar through the din of a near strife in which they were more actively interested, and about which they were more thoroughly informed. Then in Brittany, as in Wales and our South-western counties, traditions of Arthur grew, taking livelier form from the bright fancy of the Bretons, which made itself a playground among the distant hills of Wales. Geoffrey of Monmouth in the twelfth century did, no doubt, blend Breton with Welsh traditions when he invented his amusing 'History of British Kings;' but it is reasonable to suspect that the 'ancient history of Britain written 'in the Cymric tongue,' of which he professed that it had been discovered in Brittany, and had been used by him, was a mystification after the manner of Defoe, to cover his own ingenuity

in the invention of that perfect line of British kings from Brutus downwards, which has since yielded to poetry Sackville's 'Gorboduc,' Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline' and 'Lear,' and Milton's 'virgin daughter of Locrine.' Geoffrey of Monmouth, who thus suddenly sent up a spring of poetry out of the dry ground of mediæval chronicle, must have enjoyed the wrath of steady and laborious historians who, like William of Newbury, showed why 'that fabler with his fables shall be straightway spat out 'by us all.' Even Gerald of Wales, who had a wit that should have enabled him to perceive and enjoy the joke, told how a man who could detect falsehood by seeing devils leap and exult on the tongue of a liar, proved the falsehood of Geoffrey of Monmouth's history by stating that the devils swarmed about the book.

Not long after Geoffrey had earned the byname of 'Arturus' for restoring Arthur to his home in the new legendary form, it was our Walter Map, according to the belief, apparently the right belief, of M. Paulin Paris, who put a religious soul into them by adding to the series the History and the Quest of the Graal, 'Lancelot,' and the 'Mort Artus.' He it was certainly who wrote the 'Quest of the Graal,' and invented the ideally pure knight, Sir Galahad. About thirty years afterwards, when Layamon, writing in Worcestershire by the banks of the Severn, translated and enlarged into an English poem Wace's poetical version of Geoffrey's Chronicle (which had itself been enriched with the fresh legends from Brittany), the English priest, living within the sound of West of England legend, added new incidents to the story; for example, that of the taking of King Arthur after death to Avalon.

On the whole, then, we may be safe in assuming that these King Arthur legends, the growth, as we now have them, of many successive generations, have been gradually developed both in France and England, as the traditions and inventions of the Cymry and their neighbours the Bretons spread through each country, and tempted the invention of romancers. Here, however, they were born of a real patriot chief; here Geoffrey of Monmouth set them in a mimic history of British kings; and here they received from Walter Map those vital additions which gave them symmetry, and put a soul into what had been a shapeless mass of incidents of combat and amour. If this be the right reading of their history, the contribution of this country to the whole result is anything but a mean one, although much of it comes to us out of France, from the romantic fictions of the Bretons, and not of the Bretons only. But the Arthurian romances were, as M. Paulin Paris argues,

and, we think, rightly, no more than detached tales until the twelfth century, when Robert de Borron, translator not inventor, translated the first 'History of the St. Graal' as an introduction to the series, and soon afterwards Walter Map added his 'Quest of the Graal,' 'Lancelot,' and 'Mort Artus.'

We have dwelt so long upon these interesting books, that we can do little more than name the other publications issued by the Text Society. Next to the Arthur romances in chronological order is a metrical story, such as Boccaccio or Chaucer might have told, of 'The Wright's Chaste Wife,' edited by Mr. Furnivall, from a MS. in Lambeth Palace. Its date is about 1462. Nearly of the same date, and also edited by Mr. Furnivall, is a specimen of mediæval natural science, 'The Book of Quinte Essence' or the Fifth Being; that is to say, Man's Heaven, revealed by an Angel to Hermes Trismegistus after Noah's Flood. Professor Fitzedward Hall edits a poem on the 'Office and Dewtie of Kyngis,' written by William Lauder, 'for the faithful instructioun of Kyngis and 'Prences.' Lauder was a priest of the party of the reformers who wrote plays (moralities) as well as poems. He died in 1572, and his name passed out of memory till this poem of his on the 'Office and Duty of Kings' was, in 1827, reprinted in the 'Crypt,' by the Reverend Peter Hall.

The office and duty of kings was heartily promoted by a greater poet, Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, whose 'Mon-'archy' and 'Dream' and 'Testament of the Popinjay,' full of good counsel to King James V. and his courtiers, form, with some of his minor poems, the two published parts of a complete edition of his works, which the Text Society gives probably for the sake of their Northern dialect, but which will have substantial value as the works of a poet of high mark, whose merit most readers have hitherto been compelled to take upon trust. A reprint of 'Thynne's Animadversions upon Chaucer,' re-edited from the unique MS. in the Bridgewater Library, and a Scottish treatise upon grammar, by Alexander Hume, which is about contemporary with Ben Jonson's, are the other books in the long list, and bring the series down to the latest date which is likely to be recognised as within their province of study by the Early English Text Society. The books published already range over a period of more than four centuries, and every one of them gives aid to the study of the English language as well as of its literature.

When it has done all it can do in its present field of labour, this most energetic young Society already announces its design to publish the whole body of our unprinted literature of the

period called semi-Saxon; which done, 'the Society will then 'be ready to take on itself the burden laid by the late J. M. 'Kemble on the Ælfric Society, to leave no word of Anglo-'Saxon unprinted.' The Ælfric Society broke down after the production of three works in thirteen years. The Early English Text Society has published twenty-one texts in two years and a half, and chafes because it has not subscribers enough to enable it to issue in one year more than eleven texts, when it is ready to send out nineteen as the return for each subscriber's guinea. *Si potes hoc, regnas.* If it can do half as much as it is bent upon attempting, this newest of the Societies for the diffusion of our early literature will have shown a very keen and just sense of the progress made since Warburton declared of Percy's 'Reliques,' that antiquarianism was to true letters what funguses are to the oak, evidence only that the tree has lost its vigour.

ART. VIII.—1. *The original accounts of the displays in former times of the November Star-Shower, together with a determination of the length of its cycle, its annual period, and the probable orbit of the group of bodies around the sun.* By Professor H. A. NEWTON, of Yale College, Newhaven, U. S. A. American Journal of Science and Arts: 2nd Series, vols. xxxvii. and xxxviii. Newhaven: 1864.

2. *Report of a Committee of the British Association on Observations of Luminous Meteors.* By JAMES GLAISHER, Esq., F.R.S. &c., Chairman of the Committee. Report of the British Association for 1865. London: 1866.

3. *Ursprung der Meteoriten.* Von P. A. KESSELMEYER. 4to. Frankfort. 1861.

4. *Versuch eines Quellenverzeichnisses zur Literatur über Meteoriten.* Von Dr. OTTO BUCHNER. 4to. Frankfort: 1861.

BOUNDLESS in their extent as they are intricate in their device, the paths of space are known to be traversed by luminous and solid bodies not less complicated in their structure, than in the infinite variety of the tracks which they pursue. Within the last quarter of a century, theory has added the planet Neptune to the system of orbs revolving round the sun. The minor planets, with four of the same tribe discovered early in the present century, number, at the present time, more than ninety. Satellites have been added

to the trains of Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune, and a new ring to the Saturnian system. With a slow but sure step astronomy yearly enrols a new list of stars in the mystical rank, whose order and arrangement a fortuitous concourse of atoms, cosmical vortices, or last, but not least, the nebular hypothesis, were invented to explain. Breaking the bounds of order, but not exceeding the domain of calculation, comets of long and short periods have recently enlarged the class of those excentric luminaries, whose place in the solar system was first determined by Newton and by Halley. It would indeed be strange if the long despised, and much neglected subject, though familiar phenomenon of shooting stars did not receive a passing ray from the light shot athwart the remotest bounds of space by these great discoveries. The continued fall of fiery meteors and of meteorites first aroused in Chladni a spirit of inquiry ; and fostered by Olbers, who was the first to predict the discovery of a multitude of minor planets, by Howard in England, by Vauquelin, Fourcroy, and Laplace in France, and by Klaproth in Germany, the astronomical theory of luminous meteors came into existence. But this theory was quite in its infancy when Humboldt described, as a local phenomenon, the extraordinary apparition of meteors, witnessed by him on the morning of November 12th, 1799. He states in his account of that shower, that ' the oldest among ' the inhabitants of Cumana remembered that the earthquakes ' of 1766 were preceded by similar phenomena.' Humboldt afterwards ascertained that the spectacle seen by himself and Bonpland at Cumana was visible at the same time, and noted with equal admiration and astonishment, over a considerable portion of the inhabited globe.

The immediate cause of the prediction of an unusual meteoric shower after an interval of thirty-three years, was the unexpected recurrence of this phenomenon in America, with surpassing grandeur, on the morning of November 13th, 1833—a circumstance which led Quetelet, the now veteran astronomer at the Observatory of Brussels, to anticipate the return of a similar meteoric shower, on the night of the 10th of August, 1837, from the records of similar phenomena, collected by himself, in various chronicles and annals. That prediction was also verified, and the St. Laurence's meteors very rarely miss their appointment on the nights of the 9th or 10th of August in each succeeding year.

Before tracing the history of the November shower to its results, and the connected theories of luminous meteors that have been adopted to explain it, we shall proceed to give

our own impression of the scene as it appeared to us in Scotland in an unclouded sky, on the morning of November 14th, 1866. We chose for our place of observation a station upon the highest ground in the immediate neighbourhood, where no obstacle prevented our taking the most perfect notes of the surrounding scene. The night began with clouds and showers of rain; but shortly before midnight a change of the wind to the north-west dispelled the obscurity, and the fixed stars appeared about midnight with unwonted clearness. It was in fact from this time an exceptionally fine observing night. The constellation of the Lion was seen, just pawing the horizon in the east; and a few shooting-stars already began to enliven the scene,—about as many as might be seen on a fair 10th of August night—one or two in a minute, proceeding from the expected quarter. To us who had watched a clear space of the sky for half-an-hour on the preceding morning, in the vain expectation of seeing some precursor of the expected apparition, which did not make its appearance, the first symptoms of the real meteoric shower caused unmixed satisfaction. A vapour spreading over, and concealing the sky for a moment, gave our hopes a temporary check. It passed, and at half-past twelve, three meteors near together, appearing all at once, drew our attention to the spot whence they diverged. This was *in* the Lion's 'sickle,' not far from the centre of its curve; but on this point we reserved our decision, inasmuch as momentary stars, a little off the spot, about this time also attracted our attention. Like a star or planet on a stormy night peeping through a break, and immediately again hidden by the flying scud, three or four of these winking lights were seen to peep out in succession, about midway between the second and fourth stars which compose the curve of the 'sickle.' So suddenly did these appear, and so imperceptibly did they fade away, that it was not without a certain difficulty that the eye could persuade itself of their reality. Nevertheless, the occasional breaking out of meteors near the place, moving slowly outwards, with very short paths, made it obvious that they were shooting-stars seen in the line of their motion, or 'end on,' and uniform in their characters with the other meteors of the shower. The imperceptible gradation of their light from first to last appeared to be their chief and most striking feature. From these, and other observations during the shower, we fixed upon the spot last named as the principal point of radiation of the whole display, as long as a concentration of the meteors made it easy to determine it with exactness.

A flash of lightning of remarkable brightness was seen,

about twenty minutes before one o'clock, but although the horizon was quickly scanned in all directions, no trace or residue of a meteor could be detected. The same phenomenon occurred once or twice before, and afterwards, although not so vivid; but no thunder or other meteoric sound was heard to follow this, nor, indeed, any of the other brilliant exhibitions of the night. Our curiosity to know if it originated from a meteor arose from the circumstance that the first large meteor falling in our view, took place about seven minutes before the flash. This left at disappearance, near the north-western star of the great square of *Pegasus*, a luminous streak which remained in sight four minutes, moving like a wand, or like a plait of straw wafted by the wind, towards the north-eastern star, when it disappeared. The direction of the current in which this and three other separate light clouds, soon to be noticed in their order, drifted before they disappeared, was towards the south, or to a few points west of south. The second large meteor to which we have alluded, took place a few minutes after the first, traversing Ursa's square; and the portion of the luminous streak which was longest visible, remained in sight nine minutes. It was remarkable for forming the first half, and not, as usual, the last portion of the train. As it collected itself into a knot it grew visibly brighter, just as a row of gas-lights, seen one behind another, look brighter than a single flame. It wanted now a quarter of one o'clock, and once already four meteors had been seen breaking out, close together, all at once. From this time until one o'clock the numbers rose; the sky, seldom without a streak, sometimes appearing scored by three or four bright lines at once, of quickly fading light, some twenty degrees or less, but others forty degrees, or even more than forty degrees in length.

Towards one o'clock, ten minutes were lost in in-door preparations, and on resuming our watch at ten minutes past one, it would be difficult to say to what the appearance of the shower might be compared, unless it was to the course of arrows; as when the English bowmen stepped to the front at Agincourt, and discharged against the foe—

> 'With Spanish yew so strong,
> Arrows a cloth-yard long,
> That like to serpents stung,
> Piercing the weather.'

Straight and parallel was the direction, and swift and uniform the speed of this 'vastly extended system of bodies, 'moving with entire harmony and concert.' In every quarter of the heavens the appearance was the same. Meteors for

the most part as bright as the principal fixed stars, and many brighter; a large proportion comparable to Sirius, and some to Jupiter, sped through the firmament right and left, in a stream so fast and copious, that like drops of water upon a standing pool, to count them all might well have tasked the mind. We are ourselves conscious that by a natural process of 'lumping together' we attained only a proximate estimate of the numbers of the display. About one hundred and twenty radiations in a minute was the total number, which, making the proper allowances, we reckoned to be visible about this time; and again at twenty minutes past one o'clock, nearly the same enumeration was obtained. In this last interval a slight lull could be perceived, if that might be called a lull in which a burst of six or eight meteors near together breaking out all at once, would sometimes decorate the sky. The brightness of one meteor frequently obliterated that of all the rest appearing simultaneously with it. After its disappearance the eye, half dazzled, would return to its wonted place, and would forthwith find the space of blue sky from which it wandered, scored with the streaks of two, three, or more meteors, whose transit in the interim had totally escaped observation.

The decline of the shower from twenty minutes after one o'clock was rapid, but not by any means more rapid, than the steps by which it gained its greatest height. At half past two o'clock, the number of the meteors appeared to be nearly the same as it had been at midnight. At a quarter after two o'clock, the third large meteor of the morning made its transit, and disappeared close to Aldebaran, the last deposited portion of the streak forming a silvery cloud which remained plainly visible five minutes. It drifted with the current before mentioned, and disappeared close to Orion's head. The fourth large meteor, at twenty minutes before three o'clock, escaped our view, but the dazzling light which it threw around, and its train, became conspicuous objects. The latter, shaped exactly like a hoof-mark, or like a fiery foot-print in the sky, we presently detected between the square and tail of the Great Bear. At first no wider than six diameters of the moon, the ring expanded for a quarter of an hour, until the horns of a stag were fairly represented, the animal's brow being at the hindermost foot, one point at the Pointers, and the point of the other horn at the tail of *Ursa Major*. The whole length which it attained, before it vanished, was not less than fifty degrees, which it reached by opening out in the manner described, and by stretching itself at the same time towards the south. A comparison with the notes of another observer in the north

of England enables us to fix the central height of this terrific object at forty-five miles above the County of Fife, in the neighbourhood of the Frith of Tay.

It remains only to speak of the colours, and other peculiarities of the meteors. An orange-yellow colour was predominant, or at least very common, in the head. Many were white; a few green, or blue. The head frequently outstripped, or shot *ahead* of the streak, which was brightest and widest at the central part, but the most enduring portion (as in our first two splendid examples) was either the first, or the last deposited portion of the train, apparently according as some material substance was developed or encountered by the meteor in the earlier, or later portion of its path. The colour of the streaks was white or steel-grey; in a multitude of instances verging into blue, or more often into emerald green. The contrast of orange and green colours in the head and streak of short slow-moving meteors near the radiant point, sometimes produced, in such meteors, a brilliant Iris-like appearance. The greatest angular speed of flight was from twenty-five to thirty degrees in one second, which was also about their average length of path and duration. The streaks endured much longer—some of them four or five seconds—but the generality not more than two or three. A peculiar compactness of the light or luminous appearance was remarked in many of the streaks, as if they were made up of *yellow gold-dust*. The most enduring, as they faded, took an undulating or serpentine form, in figure and proportions not unlike the spiral tendrils of a climbing plant.

Altogether about 8,000 meteors were visible from our point of observation from midnight until three o'clock. At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the total number visible during the same hours was 7,724 meteors of every description. Two maxima of frequency took place,—the first when meteors appeared at a rate of 118 per minute, between one and ten minutes after one o'clock; the second when the rate was 123 meteors per minute, at twenty minutes past one o'clock. The rate of frequency at the height of the shower was fully double what it was twenty minutes before or after these two moments of the crisis or greatest abundance of the meteors. At places where a watch was kept on the mornings of the 13th and 15th, the number of meteors noted was less than might be seen on any ordinary night.

As regards its geographical extent the shower is described in nearly the same terms; its duration and the moment of its maximum was the same at Rome, in Malta, Spain, France, Germany, and England. Allowing from fifty minutes

to an hour for the difference of time between Greenwich and Rome or Malta, the greatest abundance of the meteors 'like a 'flight of swallows,' or 'like a shower of hail,' which happened there, soon after two o'clock, is evidently the same phenomenon which reached its climax, and passed it, soon after one o'clock, in London. The mortal fear in which poachers are said to have left their pursuit and fled from the hills in the upper district of Banffshire, was inspired at the same moment among the peasants of Monticelli near Rome, who looked with awe and trepidation upon what they mistook to be the end and consummation of the world. The meteors were seen by thousands at Bonn, Cologne, and Münster, in the neighbourhood of the Rhine, like rockets falling; at Saragossa like the burning shells and hand-grenades scattered in the assault and defence of that town; and from the pass of Mont Cenis, an unusual, because elevated view of the meteors, of rare beauty, was obtained. At how many more points in Central Europe, and perhaps in Asia, they were visible at the same time, accounts not yet received, but probably on their way, it is confidently expected, will amply testify. In America the shower appears to have been invisible, and Europe was the continent on the favoured side of the Atlantic Ocean. From Sir Thomas Maclear, the zealous astronomer who directs the observatory at the Cape of Good Hope, we have just received the following communication, and we publish it with the remark, that since the time when Humboldt's meteors returned both at the Mauritius and in Europe, on the morning of the 13th of November, 1832, this is the first occasion on which a star-shower has been seen, at one time, in both the north and south hemispheres of the globe:—

'Cape of Good Hope, 1866, November 19th.

'In the early part of the night of the 13th few meteors, or shooting stars, appeared. At 1h. 3m. A.M. on the 14th, the volcano burst forth, with awful grandeur, from the neighbourhood of Regulus,—orange-coloured meteors, leaving streaks of green, mingled with ordinary-looking "shooting stars," dashing along in a south-westerly direction. The scene was beyond description. Little beyond counting and general direction could be attended to; and thus, with little variation, the projectiles continued till daylight. The total number counted amounts to two thousand seven hundred and forty-two.'

Not to enter into the niceties of chronological disquisitions, a few extracts from the records of former appearances will suffice to describe the early history of the shower:—

A.D. 902. On the morning of the 13th of October (o.s.) 'an 'infinite number of stars scattered themselves like rain, from right 'to left; and that year was called the year of stars.'

A.D. 931. On the morning of the 16th of October (o.s.), there were seen 'more than a hundred shooting-stars moving in different 'directions.'

A.D. 934. On the morning of the 14th of October (o.s.), there happened 'signs in the sky as of the stars falling.'

A.D. 1002. On the morning of the 15th of October (o.s.), 'thou-'sands of small stars appeared in the constellation *Cancer*; and 'among them two stars as large as a quart measure, which went, 'one to the star Sirius, the other to Sagittarius.'

A.D. 1101. On the 17th of October (o.s.) 'the stars were seen to 'fall from heaven.'

A.D. 1202. Towards daybreak on the 19th of October (o.s.), 'stars shot hither and thither, at Bagdad, and flew against one 'another like a swarm of locusts.'

A.D. 1366. On the morning of the 22nd of October (o.s.) 'the 'stars fell from the sky in such numbers that the sky and the air 'seemed to be in flames, and even the earth appeared ready to take 'fire.'

A.D. 1533. On the morning of the 25th of October (o.s.), 'many 'thousand stars were seen to fall, and clash together, so that the 'sky appeared to be in flames.'

A.D. 1602. On the morning of the 27th of October (o.s.), 'there 'were several hundred shooting-stars great and small, mixed and 'confused, which followed each other in the same direction.'

A.D. 1698. On the 9th of November (N.S.), an unusually large number of meteors was seen at Geneva.

A.D. 1799. On the morning of the 12th of November (N.S.), 'thousands of falling stars and bolides succeeded each other during 'four hours.' The shower thus described by Humboldt at Cumana was equally seen near the Equator; in Florida, Labrador, and Greenland; at Hull in England, and near Weimar in Germany.

A.D. 1832. On the morning of the 13th of November (N.S.), the sky was filled with a multitude of meteors 'so great that it was 'impossible to count them,' at Mauritius, Mocha, and Orenburg; and generally in Europe; but the meteors were not visible in America.

A.D. 1833. On the morning of the 13th of November (N.S.), from between two and three o'clock until daybreak, an astonishing meteoric display was perceived in North America, and it was confined apparently to that continent, where it extended from Cuba to Greenland, and from Newfoundland to the far Western States.

At Boston, shortly before six o'clock, shooting-stars were falling 'about as thick as the flakes of snow in common snow-'falls. The number of meteors falling, during the fifteen 'minutes before six o'clock, was computed to have been more 'than 8,660,'—a rate per minute, be it observed, *five times more rapid than the maximum in the recent great November shower.*

The meteors of this last-mentioned exhibition were of all sizes,

from that of a point to three times the apparent diameter of the planet Venus, and one was judged to be nearly as large as the apparent size of the moon. Occasionally a bright flash, like moderate or distant lightning, indicated the passage of a still larger body. Sometimes prismatic colours were developed in the streaks of the smaller meteors, and towards daybreak many were observed of a faint but decided green. The duration, and singular shapes assumed by the luminous streaks, was a striking part of the display. Some appeared like a half circle, others like waves, or like the undulating folds of a serpent, occupying the space traversed by the meteor; and, generally, changing their shape and position a little during their continuance, as if moved by the wind. A very remarkable one was seen about twenty minutes before six. The meteor was three or four times the diameter of Venus, and it left a luminous train occupying several degrees, in the shape of the human arm half bent, which was distinctly seen for at least fifteen minutes. It was estimated by Professor Twining that the height of the meteor, at it first appearance, exceeded eighty miles, and the point of its extinction was nearly thirty miles above the earth's surface. The luminous cloud which it left, drifted from its place towards the east, with a speed of three or four miles in a minute, whilst the velocity of the meteor itself, in its transit, was not less than fourteen miles in a second.

The fixity of the point of radiation, or *direction* of the meteors with reference to certain stars of the constellation Leo, was first noticed towards five or six o'clock, on that morning, in connexion with the shower, by Dr. Olmsted, Professor Twining, and by Dr. Palmer. Professor Twining states that its place was at the bisection of a line between the first and fourth stars, or at the bisection of a line between the second and fifth stars of the curve of the 'sickle.' In every particular respect, one and the same phenomenon has obviously been reproduced, only in a somewhat less eminent degree, in the great shower we have recently witnessed.

Two remarkable facts were elicited in connexion with its return in the year 1833. *First*, the meteors exhibited the character of annual periodicity; for the appearance of the meteors in America, in the year 1833, took place on the same date (November 13th), as that on which they were seen in Europe in the preceding year. *Second*, the novel discovery was made of the existence of a radiant-point, or centre of divergence of the meteors, situated at a spot in some part of the constellation Leo, from which, as if from a common origin,

the meteors of the shower appeared to stream *outwards*, in whatever quarter of the sky they appeared. No plausible explanation, Olmsted showed, could be given of the former peculiarity, without assigning a *celestial*, and not a *terrestrial*, origin to the meteors; and he apprehended that the point of radiation of the meteors is in reality the vanishing point of straight lines, nearly parallel to each other, seen in perspective. In the next place, the extraordinary swiftness of the meteor, *not less* than fourteen miles in a second, observed by Professor Twining, and the apparent fixity of the radiant-point (independent of geographical position), warranted Professor Twining in concluding 'that the earth passes through a whole system 'of bodies, vastly extended, yet moving with entire harmony 'and concert, independent of every terrestrial cause or agency,' and that, in fine, each meteoric body *has an orbit*, in which it is in rapid motion round the sun.

It was not possible, from the small base-line of the two apparitions in 1832 and 1833, to construct an approximate orbit of the meteoric bodies. Correct, although of course fragmentary, descriptions of the former appearances of the November star-shower have, however, fortunately been preserved from very early times. A brief summary of the accounts of such occurrences is given above. It presents the reader with a short synopsis of the earlier descriptions of the phenomenon, as they are unfolded by Professor H. A. Newton, in his exposition of 'The original accounts of the displays in 'former times of the November Star-shower.' These descriptions afford Professor Newton data for 'a determination of the 'length of its cycle, its annual period, and the probable orbit 'of the group of bodies around the sun.'

All these dates, when allowance is made for change of style, are found to advance, regularly, in the year, at a uniform rate of about three days in a century; which can be accounted for partly by allowing for the difference between the lengths of the tropical and sidereal years, and partly by supposing that the place where the earth encounters the meteors is not fixed, but that, on the contrary, the node, as it is called, of the meteoric orbit, is slowly but steadily advancing round the sun, in the same direction as that in which the earth, at the same time, is moving in pursuit of it. Astronomers are warranted in concluding from this simple fact, even if it were unsupported by evidence of any other kind, that whatever may be the dimensions of the meteoric orbit, and whatever may be the position of the orbit of the meteoric group with respect to the orbit of the earth, the motion with which the meteroids

circulate in their orbits is *retrograde*, or performed in the reverse direction to that in which all the known planets revolve around the sun. The speed of the encounter, and the lucidity of the display, are accordingly much greater than would be the case if the meteors were revolving in the same direction as the earth, whenever the earth, as it must do after the lapse of a certain number of years, falls in with the meteoric system, on its path.

The above thirteen dates, from the 'year of stars,' A.D. 902, down to the year of the 'Great November Shower,' A.D. 1833, are found to agree very nearly; and to be *perfectly* reconcilable with a single meteoric period, if during two or three years at the end of each cycle of about one third of a century, the earth is supposed to meet with an extraordinary shower of meteors in November. Those of the years 1832 and 1833 were seen respectively, in Europe and America. Many steps of the series are evidently missing; and this might naturally be expected to take place, if the shower occurred under geographical conditions unfavourable to its visibility; but the *intervening* years of every cycle are, on the other hand, entirely blank. A ring of meteoric bodies, evenly distributed round the sun could not, obviously, explain this circumstance; because the earth would, in such a case, fall in with an extraordinary number of the November meteors every year. A group of meteoric bodies, performing one entire revolution in about thirty-three years, would produce the required cycle: and the bodies returning, at the end of that time, to the position where they must encounter the earth, might do so on two or three successive years, if the meteors were distributed along an arc of twenty-five, or thirty-five degrees of its circumference; because the earth would pierce through a part of the system, in that case, for two or three Novembers in succession. The ring of bodies must therefore be supposed not continuous, but the meteoric bodies to be principally condensed towards some one part of its circumference. On the other hand, a ring of the kind just described, if it revolved in less time than the earth by about eleven days, would produce the same result; because the earth, returning at the end of one year to the place where the meteors were encountered, would find that the cloud of bodies had gained eleven days, or about one thirty-third part of a revolution, and the earth would then pierce through the cloud at a different place. At the end of two years the cloud would gain twenty-two days, and the earth would then pass by it; and at the end of thirty-three years the cloud of bodies would have gained one entire revolution, and

would have returned to the position where it must again encounter the earth, and a new series of extraordinary displays would commence.

The supposition of a nearly circular orbit like that of the earth, but retrograde, is made highly probable by the fact, first pointed out by Encke, that the earth, at the moment of the great November shower, in 1833, was moving towards the very point of the ecliptic, in Leo, from immediately above which the meteors broke out; so that the direction of their speed, like that of the earth's speed at the moment, was almost exactly perpendicular to the distance of either from the sun. The meteors accordingly move in an orbit, which probably differs very little from a circle somewhat smaller than, and but little inclined (seventeen degrees) to, the orbit of the earth. They return to the node in 354·621 days. Their motion is retrograde; and their velocity (allowing for the attraction of the earth) is 20·17 miles per second, corresponding to a speed of transit through the atmosphere, amounting to 38·7 miles, or nearly forty miles per second.

The cycle appears to repeat itself four times in 113 years, so that reckoning from some date between November in 1832 and in 1833, as the commencement of a cycle, the year in which there was most reason to expect an extraordinary shower was 1866; in which it was anticipated that on the morning of the 14th of November, the western Atlantic would be visited by the meteors. Had the earth been but a few hours farther advanced on its journey before encountering the meteors at the recent remarkable apparition of the shower, its revolution in that brief interval would have placed the continent of America, instead of the Old World, as was actually the case, under the immediate focus of the shower.

The Report of a Committee of the British Association,* presented by Mr. Glaisher, on Observations of Luminous Meteors for the year 1865, contains one of the earliest notices of the appearance of a shower connected with the present great meteoric epoch. This took place at Malta on the morning of the 13th of November 1864, and affords an interesting verification of the theory just advanced. The earth at two o'clock on that morning, and again at daybreak on the morning of the 13th of November 1865, when a large display of meteors was noted at the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, was within half a degree of the position which it occupied at the height of

* The Committee consisted of Robert P. Greg, Esq., Professor Brayley, and Professor Alexander Herschel.

the great November Shower, on the morning of the 14th of November 1866. For the present, the agreement of the observed facts with the existing theory is, so far, complete. Yet it requires attention that a ring of the kind described, if it revolved in *more* time than the earth takes to complete its revolution, by about eleven days, instead of in *less* time (as above supposed), would be a form of the hypothesis which would agree equally well with the observations. The grounds upon which preference is given to the above supposition are at present, from the paucity of data alone, in some degree and to a certain unavoidable extent, provisional. Observations on the present shower must assist to remove the uncertainty. Should the ambiguity still be found to exist, the return of the shower must be watched for on the morning of the 14th of November 1867, so as to ascertain if the condition of the cycle at the present time, is one of increasing progress, or if, in accordance with the prediction, its manifestations have already passed their climax.

The dense crowd of meteors encountered by the earth in about three hours, on the morning of the 14th of November 1866, cannot have been smaller than the width of the moon's orbit in extent, reckoned in the direction in which the earth passed through the throng. Supposing with Chladni that the meteors owed their light, and doubtless, too, their heat (during their passage through the rarest parts of the atmosphere), to the compression of the air before them, the question in the next place to be considered will be, the probable constitution of the material particles of which this vast assemblage of millions of individuals is composed.

Stony or metallic masses are projected from a large class of luminous meteors, to which the term meteorites—including aërolites, siderolites, and siderites—has been applied. Of such bodies, a catalogue, contained in a recent work by P. A. Kesselmeyer, on the 'Origin of Meteorites,' supplies the dates and places of fall of between six and seven hundred individuals. The pamphlet, although singular in its object in attempting to uphold a theory of the terrestrial origin of meteorites, is yet a very valuable essay on the subject of the geographical distribution of meteorites. From the maps of the continents, upon which the place of each fall up to the year 1860 is faithfully laid down, it appears that 130 stone-falls of the list, since the beginning of the last century, belong to Europe alone; a rate of sixty a year, if extended uniformly over the whole surface of the globe. This computation of the number of meteorites fallen in with by the earth is certainly far below the

mark. Von Schreibers reckons the number at 800; and other writers at even a higher figure. *One meteorite in a day* is, therefore, not an exaggerated estimate.

The height of the fireballs from which they fall, and their speed, greatly resembles that of the November meteors. A striking example of this was recently presented by the luminous meteor which scattered a shower of stones, on the evening of the 14th May, 1864, in the neighbourhood of the town of Orgueil in the south of France. The fireball shot from a height of between thirty and sixty miles above the earth, to a height of ten or twelve miles above Nohic, near Orgueil, where it disappeared, with a speed rated at twelve or thirteen miles in a second. Humboldt termed aërolites 'pocket planets,' partly on account of their distinct petrological character, and partly because the speed of their arrival from a foreign locality, makes known that, like the planets, they roam in wide and spacious orbits around the sun.

Aërolites are fragments, evidently of larger rocks; generally heavier than granite, sometimes compact like marble, or trap, resembling in structure trachitic porphyry; at other times possessing a loosely coherent, almost earthy, texture, with considerable varieties of mineralogical composition. They consist of a flinty-grey cement, or a breccia-like volcanic tufa, in which is imbedded a multitude of fragments of broken crystals, spherules, metallic iron in grains, and here and there a small nest or spangles of yellow iron pyrites. The usual grains of metallic iron are sometimes wanting in the aërolites of Juvenas and Stannern, whilst in the siderolite of Hainholtz they exceed the stony part in bulk; and the mass of meteoric iron which fell at Agram, in Croatia, on the 26th of May 1751, was capable of being forged into nails, so entirely free from earthy admixture is the iron of which the siderite is composed. Pure siderites, or masses of meteoric iron, have rarely been seen to fall, but specimens of native iron, occasionally met with upon the surface of the earth, are evidently of meteoric origin, deposited there by meteors, the antiquity of whose fall is unknown. The metals nickel, chromium, cobalt, tin, copper, and lead, and others, have successively been discovered in meteoritic masses. Carbon occurs in the form of graphite; and phosphorus and sulphur in combination with iron. Alkaline and the other earths, especially magnesia, form, with silica and iron, the flinty part of their structure, almost identical with certain volcanic lavas, but strikingly distinguished from all terrestrial scoriæ by the occurrence of iron, in meteorites, in the metallic state. So great is the heat to which their exterior surface is exposed, in the fireball that attends their passage through the air, that a thin black crust,

or molten substance of the mineral, envelopes them completely; and they not unfrequently reach the ground so hot, that one which fell at Eichstadt, in Bavaria, on the 19th of February 1785, was first cooled in snow before it could be handled.

The first chemical analyses of meteorites, by Edward Howard, and the foreign chemists already named, at the beginning of the present century, which made known the existence of the metal nickel as a characteristic ingredient of meteoric irons and stones, and those of Berzelius, Wöhler, and others, in later times, succeeded in establishing the fact that no elementary substances have hitherto been found in meteorites which are not already known to exist upon the earth. Whether this is true regarding the mode of their chemical combinations, is a matter not yet sufficiently ascertained. The meteorites of Orgueil, besides the usual inorganic constituents, contain six per cent. of a black amorphous organic substance, composed of the organic elements carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, in proportions quite similar to those in which they occur in lignite and peat; in other words, a veritable *humus*. M. Wöhler infers from all the facts, that wherever meteorites originate, organic matter—and hence probably, also, organised matter — *organisms* in fact — must have an existence. The various annals of science, and the journals and proceedings of philosophical societies, contain many such researches. Indeed, the literature respecting meteorites constitutes already a branch of study by itself, which under the name of 'Aërolitics' has for its theme the splendid collections of meteorites at present to be found in the galleries of most of the great mineralogical museums. A work entitled an 'Index to Aerolitic Literature' has lately been published by Dr. Otto Buchner, by means of which the original accounts of meteorites may be consulted, and the facts respecting them are collected.

Considering the number (some hundreds) of aërolites which the earth encounters, meeting it at all points of its orbit, indiscriminately, in the year, and that the uniformity of the mineral composition of meteorites implies a similar unity in their origin, the body most probably to be regarded as the native source of meteorites, both from its dimensions and from the central position which it occupies in the solar system, is evidently the sun itself, or at least that portion of matter closely enveloping the sun, which reflects to us its light, and which presents to us in the twilight the appearance of the zodiacal light. Professor Brayley has inferred that the incandescent aëriform matter, which, rising in torrents from the nucleus of the sun, produces the phenomena of the solar spots, by piercing through its envelopes, consists of the elementary substances, principally

metals, including those characteristic of meteorites, which Kirchhoff, by means of the spectroscope, has discovered to exist, in the gaseous form, in the solar atmosphere. These, he also infers, are condensed into masses of the nature of bubbles, but of enormous magnitude, which, suffering further condensation, become the particles of the zodiacal light, from which they are projected in the form of what he terms 'meteoritic masses,' subsequently to become meteors and meteorites. Professor Brayley has supported these views by the induction, new to science, that the 'structural characters of meteorites are those of bodies 'which have been originally condensed from heterogeneous 'vapours — the mingled vapours of uncombined elementary 'substances variable in their nature, and requiring different 'temperatures for their maintenance in the gaseous form, but 'all existing originally at a very high temperature.'* In the absence of any evidence that we possess to the contrary, it is reasonable to suppose that the material particles which compose that envelope should, like the sun, have a certain uniformity of composition, and that at least some among them may have some tangible size. They may also be situated at as great a distance from the sun as the earth itself. Microscopical tests applied by Mr. Sorby to the stony crystals found in aërolites, do strongly favour the opinion that they have been repeatedly broken up and metamorphosed by partial fusion, and that they were originally consolidated from a state of vapour;—all of which are conditions of matter, supposed to exist most eminently in the immediate neighbourhood of the surface of the sun.

Among the variety of bodies which the theory of Chladni represents to us, as existing in circulation round the sun, and which may be supposed to be arrested by the earth, so as to produce in its atmosphere the phenomenon of shooting stars, at least one zone exists, composing apparently a distinct order of bodies by itself, almost uniformly distributed in a ring about the sun. This ring gives rise to the 'meteors of St. Laurence,' as they are called, which are seen with considerable regularity every year on the nights of the 9th and 10th of August. Other zones, each apparently composing a different ring-system, are encountered, but not so regularly, on the 2nd of January, the 20th of April, the 19th of October, and the 12th of December, producing showers of the same kind, but not so conspicuous as the star-showers of August and November. Zones, not so rich in individual meteors, may be conceived to be fallen in with by the earth on every night, and in this manner to produce the

* Proceedings of the Royal Society for March 23, 1865, vol. xiv. p. 124.

familiar appearance of shooting-stars throughout the year. The position of these circular or elliptic rings, so far as they are known, accommodate themselves to no regular system, and the meteoroids which revolve in them neither belong exclusively, nor even largely to a disk or to a lentiform group about the sun, like that which the zodiacal light is supposed to indicate. The orbits of the rings are not in general circular, as may be inferred from the ascertained great velocity of shooting-stars; but both by the levity of their substance and the incongruity of their orbits, periodical and non-periodical shooting-stars appear to resemble the nuclei of comets, which, like Biela's comet, may intersect the earth's orbit, and may have gradually become extinct.

When the levity of cometary matter is considered—which Sir John Herschel describes (by its effect in not dimming the light of certain feeble stars) as lighter than the lightest haze—it is not to be wondered at that, in the words of M. Quetelet, 'no person has yet been able to handle the material of a 'shooting-star.' Certain astronomical distinctions exist between aërolites and the class of periodical shooting-stars, which appear to reduce, if not entirely to remove, the contingent possibility of the event. Out of the large number of authentic aërolites preserved in mineralogical collections, two only—one on the 10th of August, and one on the 13th of November—are recorded to have fallen on star-shower dates. On the other hand, five or six meteorites, on the epoch of the 13th–14th of October, belong to a date when star-showers, so far as is at present known, do not make their appearance. Meteorites, moreover, with very rare exceptions, fall in the afternoon; but the time of the greatest frequency of shooting stars is in the morning hours of the day, before dawn. On these grounds a distinction is drawn between shower-meteors and aërolites, and the former are termed by Professor Newton 'Meteoroids,' while Professor Brayley includes both, or rather the bodies which become shower-meteors and aërolites, under his designation of 'Meteoritic masses.' Meteoroids, Professor Newton suggests, cannot be regarded as the fragments of former worlds, but may rather be described as the materials from which new worlds are forming. Mr. Brayley inclines, in the same manner, to suppose that 'the earth was originally 'produced by the aggregation and coalescence of meteorites, 'or of greater masses into which these had previously coalesced.'

Both shower-meteors, and aërolites, it may be, are gradually consolidating into larger bodies by collision, yet nothing, it is thought, will cause the meteors of the 14th of November to precipitate themselves in the form of stones upon the earth.

Either from their inflammable nature, their specific lightness, or loose texture, their power of penetrating the atmosphere appears to be extremely small, notwithstanding their unusually large size and brightness. Upwards of seventy meteors of the November Shower observed at Newhaven, and at other places, in the United States of America in 1863, were found to be fifteen miles higher than the level of ordinary shooting-stars, the result suggesting to Professor Newton that the shooting-stars of the 14th of November consist of more inflammable materials than those of other meteoric showers. No apprehension need accordingly be entertained, that the atmosphere would not prove a perfect shield, in the event of the return of the shower, to check their penetration, and to keep them at a safe distance from the sphere of human habitations.

ART. IX.—1. *Speeches on Parliamentary Reform in* 1866. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. for South Lancashire. With an Appendix. London: 1866.

2. *Parliamentary Reform. A Series of Speeches on that subject delivered in the House of Commons by* the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI (1848–1866). Edited by MONTAGU CORRY, B.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law.

THE general election of 1865 resulted, as is well known, in a Parliamentary majority for the Liberals commonly estimated at seventy. This decisive triumph has been attributed to the personal popularity of Lord Palmerston. It was really due to the success of the policy, at once progressive and judicious, pursued by the party of which he was the leader, and to the prosperity which, under the ascendancy of that party, the country enjoyed. The very success of the Liberal policy was made an argument against its authors by Opposition canvassers and candidates. The member for Buckinghamshire claimed the honours of a Jupiter Stator, under whose auspices the actual position should be defended and maintained. The Conservatives took their stand upon the existing state of things; ignored, or apologised for, the opposition they had for six years offered to the principal steps by which it had been attained; and contented themselves with endeavouring to create an alarm that the men who had contributed to build up that fabric of prosperity, would, through ignorance or through malevolence, destroy the work of their own hands. The demand thus made upon the credulity of the constituencies was, however, too great, and the verdict of the country was such as we have seen. But the strength and success of the Government, reconstructed

after the death of Lord Palmerston, was not commensurate to the confidence of the nation. Within less than six weeks after the meeting of the newly elected House of Commons a schism appeared in the Liberal ranks; within five months the party led by Mr. Gladstone suffered a decisive defeat. It has been pointed out that Lord Palmerston, after an electoral triumph in 1857, not less brilliant than that of 1865, found himself within a twelvemonth in a similar position. But the victory at the hustings in 1857 was due to public enthusiasm upon a particular question; the defeat to a single false step taken in the intoxication of success, and under the influence of an oversecurity which relaxed the vigilance of the leader and the discipline of the followers. In the present instance, the success sprang from the deliberate approval by the country of a policy, while the disaster was the result of a campaign entered upon with a set purpose by the leaders of a party—a campaign in which they marched on, victorious in a series of pitched battles and hand-to-hand struggles, only to reach, after gigantic efforts and unparalleled hardships, a point where, like Stanhope at Brihuega or Cornwallis at Yorktown, hemmed in by enemies, cut off from resources, they found themselves on the first reverse compelled to lay down their arms and surrender. Was that campaign, so gallantly fought, so disastrously lost, a wanton and a reckless undertaking, or was it one prompted by duty, dictated by consistency, and justified by circumstances?

If we are to believe Mr. Horsman, Reform not only is not called for, but is positively mischievous. His teaching last session may be thus summed up:—Take no notice of Reform; there is no desire for it among the people, it is only the stock in trade of the 'persistent disturber,' Lord Russell. True it is that Lord Derby introduced a Reform Bill, but such a step on his part was even more unjustifiable than on that of the Liberals; Parliament does not want Reform, the constituencies do not want it. The country has sat in judgment on Reform from 1852 to the present time, and has pronounced that such changes are 'opposed to justice, not founded in reason, fatal 'to the growth of liberty,' and 'the creed of a small and noisy 'section of politicians of extreme opinions.' While Mr. Horsman could only find reasons personal to a few statesmen for a Reform Bill, Mr. Lowe could discover none at all. The member for Calne in substance argued,—No ground is shown for Reform; no practical grievance exists, but only a theoretical one, which must survive till practice conforms to theory, and is not to be cured except by universal suffrage and equal electoral districts; meanwhile the interests of the working

classes are carefully considered and fairly legislated for. The object of representation is to secure good government: we have got that, and we ought to rest content. We cannot compare the position of affairs in 1866 with that in 1832; then the system worked ill, and there was reason for altering it; now it works well, and there is reason for maintaining it.

These direct arguments against Reform in the representation were greeted with peals of cheers by many, but were actually advanced by very few. This reticence on the part of those who by their applause evinced themselves the friends of a stationary policy, wore the appearance of an involuntary homage to the wisdom and expediency of progress, and of a confession that the objections to Reform, however powerfully urged, were felt not to be conclusive. It could not be denied that, even if there be no actual evils to be cured, no ground of discontent, real or imaginary, worth removing, there may be practical good to be effected. It would be no slight gain to quicken the concern, and deepen the attachment, of increasing numbers to their country and its institutions, by making them feel that they are, or have it within their reach to become, partners and co-operators, not mere hirelings and journeymen, in the great National Association. Still weightier is the argument that, even on Mr. Lowe's assumption that Parliament as at present constituted is ever ready to do justice to, and to legislate fairly for, both the represented and the unrepresented classes, the latter ought not to be in the position of depending solely upon the sufferance and goodwill of the former; but should be enabled to stand up for their own rights, and convey their own wishes and ideas. Those wishes and ideas may be in harmony with, or may be very different from, those now having recognised means of expression in the House of Commons. If they be the same, no harm, but only good, can follow from this fact being ascertained beyond all question. If they be different, the reason is the more cogent for affording those who entertain them an opportunity of bringing them forward and testing their value in the great arena of opinions.

No doubt some of the arguments urged in favour of Reform are theoretical and sentimental; such are arguments based upon the expediency, real or supposed, of saving the character of statesmen for consistency, and the necessity of redeeming rash promises in Parliament or hasty pledges on the hustings; but over and above all these, there are sound practical grounds why a Parliament returned with a decided Liberal majority should address itself earnestly and in good faith to the question, though none to excuse hasty and reckless legislation.

Passing, however, from objections directed against all Reform to those aimed more particularly at the Bill of last session, we find that it was denounced by many speakers in no measured terms as revolutionary, as democratic, as subversive of English institutions, and as Americanizing our Constitution. Let us endeavour, now that the frenzy of eagerness on the one side and of anger and panic on the other have subsided, calmly to recall the nature of the problem the late Government attempted to solve, and examine the solution it proposed. This retrospect will be of material service in any attempt to arrive at a judgment upon the present position or future prospects of parties.

It has been for years generally admitted that in consequence of the spread of education and the diffusion of well-being, there is in the country an increasing number of persons fit to exercise the suffrage who are excluded by the line of demarcation drawn by the Act of 1832. The advance in what we may term the natural qualifications of intelligence and independence is proportionately most marked among those who live by wages earned by daily manual labour; and, inasmuch as they are, moreover, taken collectively as a body, of slight, not to say virtually of no weight in the representation, any extension of the suffrage must have especial reference to their case. The problem is, how to give to the working men a real and appreciable voice in the representation, without placing it in their power by their numbers to overwhelm not only all other classes and interests, but that reserve of justice and impartiality which Mr. Mill relies upon to turn the scale in favour of truth and equity whenever a conflict arises between directly contending interests. It is a problem the difficulty of which has been felt and recognised not only by practical statesmen but by philosophical writers like Mr. Hare and Mr. Mill, who have taxed their ingenuity to devise methods of solving it. Mr. Gladstone in his speech on the introduction of the Bill of 1866 insisted that the Government had kept this point steadily in view, and had, for the first time, framed a measure of Reform, not upon mere guesswork, but upon statistics carefully prepared for the very purpose.

The Franchise Bill proposed, with certain limitations as to dwelling houses, to extend the suffrage to occupiers at a rental of 14*l.* in counties; a step which it was declared would increase the number of voters by 172,000. It also proposed to admit persons having an investment of 50*l.* or upwards in a savings' bank, and certain others to be qualified by copyhold or leasehold premises within the limits of parliamentary boroughs;

the former were estimated to increase the county constituencies by 10,000 or 15,000, the latter by 8,000 voters. The total addition contemplated, therefore, to the 550,000 names already found upon the county registers of England and Wales was 195,000. To the existing borough constituencies of 514,000, the Government measure added an estimated number of 25,000 by the abolition of the rate-paying clauses, 35,000 by new provisions respecting compound householders, a further number by the new lodger and savings' bank franchises, which it was supposed would together yield 16,000 voters, and 144,000 by the reduction of the present 10*l.* qualification to one of the clear yearly value, as defined by the Bill, of 7*l.*; thus making in all an increase of 220,000 electors. In round numbers the present county and borough constituency of England and Wales consists of 1,000,000 voters, to which the late Government proposed to add 400,000. Let us now see the proportion which it was intended that those voters who live by wages earned by manual labour should have in this body.

According to the returns laid before Parliament, in which the definition of a working man was generally allowed to be a wide one, the number of such electors already amounts to 126,000. Mr. Gladstone proposed to reinforce these by 200,000 of their fellows, which would have raised them to 22 per cent. of the whole electoral body of England and Wales. Mr. Disraeli threw out in debate a conjecture, confessedly an extreme one, that the working men to be found among the freeholders on the county registers, and of whose existence Mr. Gladstone took no account in his estimates, exceeded in number those on the existing borough registers. Assuming this to be the case, still the enfranchised wage-earners, had the Bill passed, would have amounted to no more than 33 per cent., or less than one third, of the total constituency. If, however, we consider the county constituency alone, the Bill of last year, inasmuch as the voters to be enfranchised under its provisions were almost exclusively drawn from other ranks than those of labour, would in fact not have increased, but diminished, the present influence of the operatives in county elections. Similarly, if we consider the borough constituency separately, it appears that, assuming, as Mr. Gladstone did, the whole of the newly enfranchised 200,000 or 220,000 to be working men, the total number of such voters in boroughs would have amounted to 326,000 or 346,000. They would, therefore, have been in a minority, even on the strained supposition that artisans of all descriptions would entertain the same opinions, be actuated by the same motives,

and record the same votes. Nor must it be supposed that their command of seats would have been at all proportional to their numbers on the registers. The returns of the late Government showed that they would have enjoyed a majority in sixty boroughs returning 100 members; and this proportion would not have been materially affected by the Bill for the redistribution of seats subsequently introduced.

The nature of the proposed new electors appears still less to have warranted the alarm created by the Bill in certain quarters than their numbers. In the case of one half of them we can call Mr. Disraeli and the Tory leaders as witnesses to character.

Occupiers in towns below the existing franchise of 10*l.* were not of the number of those to whom the Derby-Disraeli Government thought the privilege of voting ought to be entrusted; but such, in the opinion of that Government, were not only the 14*l.* occupiers in counties, but the 10*l.* occupiers likewise. No doubt it may be said that, if on the one hand Mr. Disraeli proposed to add 200,000 voters to the counties, on the other he proposed to annihilate a number estimated by himself at upwards of 100,000, by disfranchising the freeholders voting for property situate within the limits of parliamentary boroughs; but the personal fitness of the 10*l.* occupiers remains unaffected by this consideration. In fact, the author of the Bill of 1859 ultimately professed his readiness to abandon the disqualifying provision. Even in the case of the borough franchise the fears of the Conservative Cabinet were not so great but that they subsequently offered a reduction which it was intimated in general terms should be of no inconsiderable amount. In the following year Lord Palmerston, whom it is now the fashion with the opponents of Reform to claim as one of themselves, proposed a Bill for lowering the suffrage to 10*l.* in counties, and to that 6*l.* value in boroughs which has since been declaimed against as equivalent to the *ne plus ultra* of Radicalism. Lord Palmerston's Bill, moreover, incredible as it may now sound, was read a second time in a House elected under the auspices of Lord Derby's Government without a dissentient vote, nor did any one venture directly to challenge the amount at which it fixed the franchise in town or in country.

No doubt it was alleged by the Opposition last session that whereas it had generally been supposed that the working men on the borough registers amounted to no more than from 5 to 10 per cent. of the town voters, the recently collected statistics showed a far greater number. But the argument based upon the allegation of great power already enjoyed by the operatives

was felt by those who would employ it as an argument against their further enfranchisement to be a two-edged weapon; since their undiscovered and unsuspected possession of such a power during a long term of years proved that the use made of it could not be so antagonistic to the rest of the community, much less so dangerous to society, as the prophets of evil would have had their countrymen to believe.

The accuracy of the returns upon which Lord Russell's Bill was based was disputed, but it could not on the most liberal computation, not to say exaggeration, be maintained that the manual labourers constitute more than 27 or 28 per cent. of the existing electoral body for towns; nor could the statement be disproved that, notwithstanding the advance of the operatives in numbers, education, and well-being, they actually form a smaller portion of the borough constituency, and thus enjoy less political power, now than they possessed at the time of the passing of the great Reform Act. The correctness of the estimated additions to be made by the scheme of Lord Russell's Government in the towns was also challenged, but does not appear to have been materially shaken; the most ingenious of their opponents only succeeding, on his own showing, in discovering an error or a discrepancy of a few thousands. The omission of any one of the secondary franchises—an omission which Mr. Gladstone appeared not unwilling to concede—would have removed the objection, such as it was, founded on this allegation.

The Bill of last session, then, was not revolutionary, for it did not transfer political power from those now possessed of to those now excluded from it. The Bill did that which any Reform Bill must in some measure do—it admitted the unenfranchised to a share of power with the enfranchised, but not to a preponderating share. Still less was it a democratic measure, for it did not give a supremacy to incompetent numbers over property and intelligence, even assuming that all the strata of society below the 10*l.* occupiers are impenetrable to reason and to moral influences.*

* We use the word democracy as signifying the exercise of supremacy by a numerical majority of the entire people, irrespective of the consideration whether the entire people be educated and independent or not. In every public body or assembly in which matters are decided by a majority, the supremacy of numbers obtains; but, wherever the right of voting is based upon considerations of personal fitness, the presumption is that all the voters, although not equally able and well informed, yet are all desirous and capable of weighing and judging facts and arguments put before them. We are quite

The opponents of the Bill apparently felt the difficulty in which they were placed, and accordingly, while their declamations were levelled against revolution, democracy, and American institutions, their arguments were directed to the alleged tendencies of the Bill; that it must lead the way to further measures of a similar character hereafter; that it unsettled the present state of the law without finally settling any other; and to the anomalies it would leave or create in our system of representation. Now to demand finality as the condition of a Reform, or indeed of any other measure, is simply to demand an impossibility. It is doubly unreasonable on the part of those who avow themselves the friends, or who recognise the necessity, of a progressive policy. 'It is an indisputable 'doctrine of antiquity,' said Pitt in 1785, 'that the state of 'the Representation is to be changed with the change of cir-'cumstances.' Such has been the case throughout our history both as to franchises and as to seats, and so it must be again. No settlement can be absolutely final, unless indeed as regards the former we could find a self-adjusting franchise, i.e. one sufficiently elastic to admit from time to time those who are fit for the suffrage, and to exclude those who are unfit, without any direct interposition of the legislature. Mr. Lowe appears to consider that we have such a franchise already in the 10*l.* qualification. In his opinion a process of spontaneous enfranchisement is already going on so rapidly that the working men must, if the condition of the country continues such as it is, at no distant period acquire a majority upon the register. Unfortunately for the theory the fact presents itself that the growth of the urban electoral body is at the present time, and has been for many years, slower than the growth of population, much more than that of wealth, in the represented towns; while in respect of working men, the number, as we have before stated, enjoying the franchise compared with that of other electors, is actually less now than in 1832. In the opinion, however, of not a few, the 7*l.* franchise, assuming the prosperity of the country to continue to advance, might have proved such a self-acting franchise. At all events it was accepted, even by Mr. Bright and the more advanced Liberals, as one that might reasonably be expected to afford a settlement of the question for a generation.

---

aware that Mr. Mill, and other writers, consider that pure democracy should only prevail among people universally qualified, and should provide for the representation of minorities; but we use the word in its ordinary acceptation, and that in which it was made use of against Lord Russell's measure.

The charge that the Bill would have left our representative system full of anomalies, that while correcting some it would have created others, is one the truth of which is as undeniable as that of the absence of a guarantee for finality. Such must be the operation of any measure of Reform that stops short of a recognition not only of the 'rights of man,' but of 'the 'rights of woman;' that fails to give effect to the maxim that representation should be coincident and coextensive with taxation; a maxim which, however just as to States, has not till more recently been applied to persons, and, we believe, has nowhere been consistently acted upon in this its later application. At all events, an outcry against anomalies proceeds with a bad grace from moderate reformers who advocate a limited franchise, and a representation based, not upon equal electoral districts, but the natural, or historical, divisions of counties and of boroughs.

If the specific objections made to the Bill were not commensurate or in keeping with the denunciations launched at it, still less were the motions upon which issue was taken. These motions betrayed a consciousness that the sweeping charges of revolution and democracy were felt to be in sober reality untenable. Not only was no proposition made summarily to reject a measure which was described as threatening the overthrow of all that Englishmen have been taught most to value, but not even one of its main provisions was met with a direct negative, but only by palliatives and modifications. Neither of the two plainest and most straightforward propositions for amending the Bill met with any signal success. Mr. Walpole's motion to substitute the juryman's qualification of 20*l.* for a 14*l.* rental as the condition of a county vote—a motion deserving every consideration both for its own sake and that of the quarter whence it proceeded—was rejected by a considerable majority on a division. Mr., now Sir William, Bovill's notice to raise the qualification in boroughs from 7*l.* as proposed in the Bill to 8*l.*, was, owing to the defeat of Lord Russell's Government on a previous amendment, never brought to an issue. Its author, however, who found himself almost immediately upon the hustings at Guildford, appeared more desirous of explaining and apologising for his proposal than of justifying or exalting it.

The other motions made against the Bill were all of a more or less indirect character, and often curiously at variance with the antecedents of those who supported them. Thus the traditionary champions of small, not to say of rotten or nomination boroughs, appeared seized with a new-born zeal for a

redistribution of seats; a zeal so burning that they even wished redistribution to take precedence of that extension of the franchise which had almost exclusively formed the staple of Reform speeches and Reform addresses for a long series of years. The members of Lord Derby's former Government, from being the advocates of a qualification measured by rental, were converted to and became the supporters of one determined by rateable value. The adversaries of Reform were clamorous to enlarge the scope, and increase the effect, of one Bill by the addition of a second, if not of a third Bill. The devotees of purity of election offered a somewhat singular proof of their sincerity by insisting on the insertion of their remedies for bribery in a Bill which they were using their every endeavour to throw out.

While the Opposition thus found itself in a false position, and one open to much misinterpretation, the course of Lord Russell's Government, with all its errors, and all its indiscretions, was at least one that raised them above suspicion and possible imputation upon their honour, their earnestness, and their sincerity. The introduction of a Bill at all by a Government at the head of a party to which the constituencies, as at present composed, had proved themselves so signally favourable, is not attributable to unworthy or personal motives. At a time when, as it was alleged and believed, there was apathy, if not repugnance, to Reform in the country, they chivalrously, if rashly, staked their existence as an Administration upon the cause; lastly, although it may have been an error in judgment not to resign after the Pyrrhic victory on Lord Grosvenor's motion, they refused, as is sufficiently well known, to accept a vote of confidence after passing under the Caudine forks of defeat.

It is not our task, nor have we undertaken, to vindicate the provisions of the Bill of last session. We are not concerned to inquire whether, as a whole, it was the best and wisest measure to have been proposed. All we now contend for is, that it was not that which its opponents charged it with being, and that the indirect and evasive manner in which it was encountered, raised a strong presumption in its favour. We believe, moreover, that the defeat of the Bill was facilitated, not so much by its own demerits, as by the tactical blunders of its authors.

Lord Palmerston is reported to have bequeathed to future Ministers the advice, never to introduce a Reform Bill in the first session of a new Parliament. Be this as it may, there were other good and sufficient reasons against, and certainly

no need for, such an attempt in the last session. The veteran reformer, Lord Russell, had retired to the Elysian shades of the House of Lords. The new Phaethon into whose hands the reins of leadership had devolved might well have been content for a season to guide his team along the beaten track of the ecliptic, instead of striking out a new course in the Parliamentary heavens. The country, though by returning a large majority of the party advocating Reform, it had shown that it was prepared for such a measure, yet evinced no impatience. The Government had nothing more formidable to apprehend by postponing Reform to another session than taunts from Tory rivals and bluster from Radical supporters, both alike impotent to affect their position, and which the most ordinary amount of moral courage should have enabled them calmly to endure. They might this year have brought in a Reform Bill without laying themselves open to the charge of making crude and fragmentary propositions because they had not time to mature a complete measure. The introduction of a half measure was resented by a portion of the House as an attempt first to entrap, and then to coerce them, into a wider measure of Reform than was made apparent. The announcement that the Government would stand or fall by their Bill, first communicated to a deputation of agitators, the declaration in the amphitheatre at Liverpool, that the Government 'knew with whom they had to deal,' were similarly resented as attempts to drive, rather than to lead, the House of Commons. But above all, by delay, Lord Russell and his colleagues would have in great measure escaped the injurious suspicion of having accepted the patronage, and fallen under the mesmeric fascinations, of Mr. Bright. 'The Bill had its 'birth not in Downing Street, but in Birmingham,' was one of the most effective shafts sped at it. Mr. Bright's own statement that he had counselled Lord Russell to introduce a franchise Bill only; his not-forgotten declaration a few months earlier that he looked to a Suffrage Bill to afford the leverage by which to obtain further changes, coupled with his avowed wish to secure a redistribution of seats in favour of the great town-populations, alarmed the Conservatives. It no less excited the jealousy and apprehensions of not a few moderate Liberals, who held that their party was being sacrificed to its smallest but noisiest section.

We would speak with all respect of the abilities and eloquence of Mr. Bright. We acknowledge that, if he has sinned much in giving provocation, he has been grievously sinned against, and that, within the walls of the House, he has exhibited great self-

restraint. Would that he always held such language as in the discussion of the second reading of Mr. Clay's Educational Franchise Bill, and in other debates. Would that he did not injure his cause by raising, in connexion with it, questions which savour of communism, questions which at all events are not those of our day, and which, if raised by others, he would be the first indignantly to denounce as brought forward only to divert attention, or create a prejudice against the point in issue. He would then command a confidence which is now withheld, he would then not only incalculably increase his utility to his cause, his party, and his country, but become, if he so pleased, a pillar of strength in a Liberal Government. Unfortunately the statesman in the House sinks into the demagogue without; the political leader into the blustering agitator. With many of the sentiments expressed in his platform harangues, and still more in his occasional letters, we can not only have no sympathy, but we must emphatically repudiate them. We do not dwell upon attacks and reflections upon laws and institutions which, as we believe, have greatly contributed to make England powerful, free, and prosperous above other nations; we do not dwell upon such rant as that Englishmen without votes are in a position to be compared to that of serfs or negroes either before or after emancipation, or even to that of some Continental people, who only have the weapon of the suffrage placed in their hands that they may employ it to commit political suicide. These things may be passed over, the former as philosophical or historical speculations, the latter as rhetorical exaggerations. We accept his own explicit declarations that it is not his object to convert England into a democratic republic, that he takes his stand upon the ancient lines of the Constitution, that his aim is to make the House of Commons more fully the House of the People, and that a household suffrage throughout the boroughs would, in his opinion, best fulfil this condition. We only regret that his zeal to obtain that which he does wish should make him appear the advocate of that which he does not wish, and that his explanations and retractations, being addressed to different audiences, and through different channels, should so often fail to remove the impression his first utterances have created. We sympathise with his burning denunciations of pauperism, ignorance, and crime, but we reject, as unworthy and untrue, his insinuation, as we understand it, that these results of a long chain of natural, historical, and legislative antecedents are immediately due to the action of the classes that now rule the country; that the legislature, from blind stupidity or perverse

malignity, refuses to exercise a power it possesses of extinguishing these evils; that no good measure ever has, or ever will be, extorted from a House of Commons representing the present constituencies except under the dread of that physical force which he has more than once hinted at as a reserve, even while deprecating its use. Against the teaching that the people are in antagonism to the laws under which they live, and must look upon those who have an influence in making those laws as their natural enemies, if any defence be needed, we set the judgment of one whom Mr. Bright himself would hardly accuse of being a timid reformer, or animated by ill-will to his countrymen. In his work on Representative Government, in a chapter in which the claims of the working men to the suffrage are strongly urged, Mr. Mill thus writes of the classes in whom political power is now vested:—

'They willingly make considerable sacrifices, especially of their pecuniary interest, for the benefit of the working classes, and err rather by too lavish and indiscriminating a beneficence; nor do I believe that any rulers in history have been actuated by a more sincere desire to do their duty towards the poorer portion of their countrymen.'

Mr. Bright himself only last session gloried, and justly gloried, in the part he had himself borne in a long course of beneficent legislation. The working men have repeatedly by addresses and deputations to leading statesmen, still more by their general conduct and contentment, marked their appreciation of the spirit which has animated, and the course which has been pursued by, Parliament in regard to their interests. Recent legislation has undeniably done much to improve the condition of the toiling masses. It has done so, first, by the repeal of mistaken laws that fettered industry and trade, and by financial reforms which have not only cheapened the necessaries of life, but have brought comforts, and even luxuries, within the reach of millions. It has done so, secondly, by the enactment of measures such as the Factory Acts, for the protection of the weak against extortion and oppression, of such measures as the Post Office Savings Bank Act and the Government Annuities Bill for the encouragement of the provident and the self-reliant; and by facilitating the diffusion of knowledge, and offering increased opportunities for education to the poor.

Of all the blunders which have been committed by the leaders of the advanced popular party, the greatest appears to us to be the tone and demeanour they have assumed towards the House of Commons. For by a strange perversion, it is not

against the Government, though it be a Tory Government—it is not against the House of Lords—it is not against the Crown—but it is especially against the House of Commons that war has been declared by these leaders of the people; and this warfare began in contumely to end, it seems, in intimidation. The authors of this policy are committing a great mistake. They are measuring their irregular forces against the greatest power in this country; and we doubt not that if the privileges and authority of the House of Commons could be seriously menaced from such a quarter, the House would withstand the pressure of mobs, as firmly and as successfully as it withstood of old the pressure of the Crown. Can it be denied that the House of Commons does honestly represent in all their varieties the knowledge, the wisdom, the energy, the enterprise, the traditions and the hopes of the people of England? From the free debates of that House, no opinion, however wild, is excluded, for it may be answered there. The votes of the majority of that House, won by argument, and swayed in some degree by opinion out-of-doors, are the ultimate test to which the policy of this country is referred. For behind that House stands the great mass of the property and intelligence of the nation, which it represents. They must have a singularly low conception of the character and spirit of Englishmen, who suppose that the deliberations of that august body are to be governed by unauthorised assemblages, who represent nothing more than the opinions prevalent among a single class of the community; or who imagine that, like the Convention of France in 1793, the British Parliament is to surrender its judgment to the Sections of the Commune. The majority of the people of this country are favourable to Reform—favourable to an extension of the suffrage, on constitutional principles. But the immense majority of the nation are opposed to any measure which would overthrow the balance of the Constitution; and substitute the preponderance of the class, the most powerful in numbers, but the weakest in political experience and education, for the union and adjustment of forces, by which the Constitution has for ages been maintained. Confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the House of Commons is the first duty of an English citizen; and no man has a right to assume, either from its past history or from its present composition, that the Lower House of Parliament will be wanting in its true duties to the people.

As—

> He who of old would rend the oak
> Dream'd not of the rebound,

so, by a remarkable Nemesis, which should serve as a warning to oratorical athletes and intellectual gladiators who cannot resist the temptation of making a point or producing a sensation, Mr. Lowe unwittingly gave the chief impulse to an agitation in favour of Reform, and Mr. Bright raised the main obstacle to its success. By a similar Nemesis the alarmists who have magnified the intention of the one, the agitators who have exaggerated or distorted the views of the other, have each mainly contributed to increase the influence and power of the object of their fear or of their aversion.

The immediate result, however, of the struggles and the errors, the hopes and the fears, of last session, is that, for the third time within eighteen years, we are doomed to the evils of government by a minority. There is this difference in the position of the Derby-Disraeli Administration now and in 1852 and 1858—that it then leant for support upon one extreme of the Liberal party, whereas now it rests its hopes upon the other. Not the less, however, than on both previous occasions does the Tory Government hold office, solely on the condition of carrying out the policy it thwarted and denounced when in opposition. Now, as formerly, Lord Derby commenced by endeavouring to seduce leading Liberals from their party allegiance, and labouring to explain away the difference between a policy of progress and one of resistance to progress, as an arbitrary, not an actual and natural, division. The country is, nevertheless, head and heart, in favour of a progressive policy and a constitutional measure of Reform, and, we trust, will not allow Tories to cajole or Chartists to frighten it out of either. A policy of improvement which, not content with maintaining the existing good, is ever on the watch to increase its sum, and to remove abuses, seems to us, in the present stage of society, almost necessarily to involve some extension of the suffrage. Not the least merit of a popular Government is, that it trains and improves the faculties, both moral and intellectual, of individuals, and cultivates and develops a manly and vigorous national character. On the contrary, under a Government in which the people are passive, although departments may be admirably organised, affairs well conducted, although the people may attain a high degree of prosperity, that interest in and care for public affairs, which is so beneficial as an antidote to the narrowness and selfishness of material pursuits, is never awakened or speedily becomes dormant. Even material prosperity, the accumulation of riches, the cultivation of the graces and elegancies of life, the maintenance of law and order, security against foreign arms,

are, in the long run, best to be promoted by arraying an increasing number of the competent and the trustworthy in the cause of the commonwealth.

No doubt the spectacle of men adopting, coincidentally with their accession to the offices, the policy of their adversaries, is not one tending to edification or to a high standard of political morality. No doubt it is, from a constitutional point of view, no light matter that the party whose aim and function it should be to watch and check the tendencies of the age should assume the garb and character of its opponents, and that the power of resistance in the body politic should be converted into a motive force. No doubt, from a Conservative point of view, there is an especial danger in the undertaking of a Reform Bill, however skilfully fenced and guarded, by a Tory Government. Thus, in 1859, the Derby-Disraeli Administration found itself compelled to throw over, one by one, all the safeguards it had relied upon and held out to its adherents as sufficient to neutralise the more liberal and democratic portions of its schemes; while the Tories, who then followed their leader with a blind devotion only paralleled by that with which the Assassins obeyed the Old Man of the Mountain, found themselves brought to the very verge of a precipice.

We have, however, to look at things from the Liberal point of view, and to consider what course duty and policy recommend to that party. The Liberal Government and the Liberals in Parliament failed in the performance of the task entrusted to them at the general election. Lord Russell's Cabinet shrank from a dissolution, and not only Parliament but the country acquiesced in the pacific and unconditional surrender of their position. If now the Derby-Disraeli Government can reconcile it to their consciences, and are prepared to submit to the humiliation of doing the work they have hitherto condemned, opposition on the part of the Liberals or their leaders would be factious. The Liberals must, on the contrary, if needs be, accept the mortification of seeing laurels that should legitimately have been their own, gathered by their adversaries. But the Tories, if grace be thus extended to them, must enter upon their course of progress and reform earnestly and sincerely. A stationary policy in England, a retrograde policy in Ireland, should not serve them. No attempt to trade upon administrative ability, no attempt to frighten the country into a panic about land or sea defences, should avail them. They must not think to adopt the Liberal creed in words and eschew it in deeds. Especially they must not hope, like Shakspeare's sanctimonious pirate who went to sea with the Ten Command-

ments, but scraped out 'Thou shalt not steal,' to be allowed to strike out the article of that creed most obnoxious to themselves—Reform. The precedents of 1852 and 1859 may act as warnings. In 1852 the Tory Government contented itself with ignoring or repudiating the policy it had clamoured for in opposition, and vainly hoped thereupon to be allowed to take up a new position of immobility. In 1858 it ventured further: it threw out certain sops to lull the vigilance of the Opposition, and then attempted the great, but as it proved fruitless, mystification of a sham or retrograde measure of Reform.

Mr. Bright has no hope of the third Derby-Disraeli Government, and is apparently prepared to exterminate them like vermin to which no law should be given. Speaking at Manchester, on the 24th of September, of the qualifications and power of Lord Derby's Administration to deal with the question of Reform, he thus expressed himself:—

'I hope no Reformer dreams of such things. If you like you may trust your life to your most bitter foe, but I will not do so if I know it. We had free trade from free-traders, for when Sir Robert Peel repealed the corn laws he was as good and sincere a free-trader as if he had spoken free-trade for the previous five or six years from this platform on which I now stand. Lord Derby is not a Reformer, nor will he introduce a Reform Bill in the character of a Reformer. If he does introduce one it will be as before—it will be some juggle, some dishonest trick, something base, like the means by which they overthrew the Bill of Lord Russell's Government.'

Again at the Reform Banquet held at Manchester on November 21st, after referring to the attempt made by Mr. Disraeli to disfranchise a large number of county voters in 1859, he proceeded:—

'I cannot believe that a man who made such a proposition seven or eight years ago can produce a good Reform Bill.'

And he further added:—

'I do not believe that the Government have determined to bring in a Reform Bill, or that they can by any possibility bring in a Reform Bill which the Reformers of this country can accept.'

A more forbearing and, in our opinion, a juster policy is indicated in Mr. Brand's terse and pithy reply to an invitation to attend a Reform banquet at Manchester.* The same view is more fully expressed in Mr. Gladstone's brief speech on the withdrawal of his Bill. This speech, we are glad to see, has

* This admirable letter appeared in the 'Times' of October 6th, and in other papers of the same date.

been thought worthy of a place among his greater and more ambitious efforts in the collection named at the head of this article. We quote a passage to be found at page 306 of the volume:—

'We shall in future be glad, irrespectively of all narrow and selfish considerations, to support any measure we may deem at once prudent and effectual, if such a measure should be introduced by those who may be more successful than we have been in the attempt to settle a great imperial question. We shall sincerely congratulate them upon a result so happy for the country. At the same time, I also feel it my duty to say, without reflecting in any way upon those who have been opposed to us, that we shall feel bound to resist, to the utmost of our power, any illusory or reactionary measure.'

While endorsing the opinion that Liberals in Parliament should give the new Government the fairest trial and exercise the utmost self-control and forbearance, we do not intend to imply a condemnation of Liberal movements in the country. Liberals in Parliament, with few exceptions, did their duty manfully last session; it remained for those outside, more especially for the unenfranchised, to give them moral strength by showing themselves earnest in the cause, yet temperate. The more, however, the signs of a desire for Reform emanate spontaneously from the public, the less they are fanned by professed politicians and parliamentary men, the greater will be their weight and their effect. We have condemned much in Mr. Bright's temper and language. He has done much in his autumn and winter campaign to entitle himself to the designation of Lord Derby's 'best man.' But we gladly acknowledge that he has rendered this signal service to the cause of Reform, that he has taught the unrepresented that if they would obtain a recognition of their claims they must exert themselves to disprove the charge of apathy and indifference. The circumstances attending the demonstrations that have taken place should suffice to convince all thinking men of the desirability of effecting a settlement of the question of Reform. Men in England and in Scotland did not only flock to hear the greatest and the most eloquent popular orator of the day; the monster meetings on Woodhouse Moor, on Glasgow Green, at Campfield, and in the streets of London, where no such attraction was presented, testify to a genuine heartiness in a cause. They testify no less to the calmness and orderly disposition, one not to be disturbed by exciting appeals or inflammatory harangues, of those who are thus seeking an extension of the franchise. On the other hand, the abstinence from all

participation in agitation by an equal or still greater body of the working men, if it proves, as Conservative writers and speakers have not been slow to point out, indifference or hostility to the movement, disproves the favourite assertion of the same reasoners that the operatives throughout the country are of one mind and would act politically in one mass. The much-dreaded trades' unions, it is now clearly seen, represent but one party among the wage-earners, and even on their own special ground may be encountered, as we have recently found in Derbyshire, by a rival organisation—that of the anti-unionists.

What course the Tory Government will adopt in reference to Reform we do not venture to prognosticate. On the one hand the temptations will be great to dally with the question, and to delay by plausible excuses the introduction of a Bill; on the other, boldness in grappling with the difficulty presents the only hope of genuine and durable success. It is surmised that the master-mind in the Cabinet has long believed himself to have a special mission to settle the Reform question. While Lord Derby, in his Ministerial statement on accession to office, touched most guardedly on the subject, Mr. Disraeli, in his hustings speech on re-election, expressed himself almost in sanguine terms of the qualifications of himself and of his friends to deal with Reform.*

---

* It would be an idle and an endless task to criticise the innumerable projects of Reform to which the press has given birth in the last few months—all, probably, sufficiently remote from the result at which Parliament will at last arrive. But one of them appears to us sufficiently remarkable and instructive to deserve notice in this place. We allude to a 'Proposal for a Constitutional Reform Bill,' addressed to Lord Derby by Mr. Edward Cox, the Recorder of Helston. This writer, whose intentions are Conservative as well as Liberal, advocates the extension of the borough franchise to the standard of the present municipal franchise, that is, household suffrage; and he would give the county franchise to leaseholders, copyholders, and tenants for life of 5*l.* annual value, and to occupiers of houses or land of 20*l.* His scheme is therefore very comprehensive, and it has the advantage of resting the franchise on a fixed and definite principle. The most important portion of his pamphlet is, however, that in which he demonstrates from the official returns that household suffrage would add only *twenty-three* per cent. to the existing constituencies of 156 English and Welsh boroughs. In seventeen large towns the proportion would be much larger, but, as these towns almost all return members of the most advanced Liberal opinions, with their present constituencies, they could do no more if those constituencies were extended. Mr. Cox calculates the whole addition to the borough constituencies of England and Wales, with household suffrage, at only 150,302.

Mr. Gladstone's speeches during the last session have appeared in the volume already referred to. Mr. Bright's addresses since the close of the session are announced for publication. Mr. Disraeli's speeches on Reform are, it is known, in course of preparation. We regret that Mr. Lowe's should not be added to complete the catalogue of representative orators on this important question. The collection of Mr. Disraeli's speeches we look forward to with singular interest; the more so as, we understand, it will extend over a long series of years, and therefore embrace, not only his numerous speeches against the Bills of others, but those in support of his own measure of Reform. Mr. Disraeli is not only an eminent public man, distinguished for oratorical power and versatile ability; he has for a period, now not far short of twenty years, with indomitable pluck and imperturbable temper, led the Tory party in the House of Commons. A collection of his speeches must be looked upon, or claim to be looked upon, as embodying the views, not merely of an individual, but of a party. Its appearance in present circumstances is significant. Mr. Disraeli, although in his capacity of leader of the Conservatives, he has resisted every Reform Bill except that introduced by himself, is believed to entertain no warm admiration for the Act of 1832, or its results. The Conservatives now appear disposed to appeal to the selfishness and fears of the middle, against the lower classes. But their leader has more than once described in no flattering terms the effects of that 'middle-class 'Government' which the Reform Act raised up. He has been heard to pronounce its social, colonial, commercial, and financial policy to be a disastrous failure. He has lamented its want of sympathy with the working classes, and regretted the extinction of the old freemen and scot and lot voters. He has more than once expressed himself in favour of other franchises than those founded upon property, but at the same time intimated that territorial influence is scarcely adequately represented. He has declared that any measure of Reform should be large and comprehensive. The above expressions may be, however, weapons employed in desultory warfare against opponents, and do not necessarily reveal his own aim and intentions.

The English representation is one so essentially anomalous, that no theory can, we believe, be framed that will accurately account for, and correspond with, all its parts. Certainly no practical statesman would attempt inflexibly to carry out a preconceived theory in regard to it. But he will probably have a leading principle, or ruling idea, which colours his views, gives

character to his acts, and from which he will not depart, but as an exception and in deference to some cogent reason.

The leading idea in Mr. Disraeli's mind is to be found in a work of older date than any of his speeches in the capacity of leader of a party. In 'Coningsby,' the author, speaking not as Sidonia or any other imaginary character, but in his own proper person, thus expresses his views :—

'When the crowned Northman consulted on the welfare of his kingdom, he assembled the ESTATES of his realm. Now an estate is a class of the nation invested with political rights. There appeared the estate of the clergy, of the barons, of other classes. In the Scandinavian kingdoms to this day, the estate of the peasants sends its representatives to the Diet. In England, under the Normans, the Church and the Baronage were convoked, together with the estate of the Community, a term which then probably described the inferior holders of land, whose tenure was not immediate of the crown. This Third Estate was so numerous, that convenience suggested its appearance by representation ; while the others, more limited, appeared, and still appear, personally. The Third Estate was reconstructed as circumstances developed themselves. It was a Reform of Parliament when the towns were summoned. In treating the house of the Third Estate as the house of the people, and not as the house of a privileged class, the Ministry and Parliament of 1831 virtually conceded the principle of Universal Suffrage.'

He then adds that 'The Ministry and Parliament of 1831 'should have announced that the time had arrived when the 'Third Estate should be enlarged and reconstructed.' They would then have avoided 'perplexities as to the nature of the 'representative principle ;' and, 'another class not less numerous than the existing one, and invested with privileges not 'less important, would have been added to the public estates of 'the realm ; and the bewildering phrase "the people," would 'have remained, what it really is, a term of natural philosophy, 'and not of political science.'

The same idea of Estates, or of a Third Estate made up of privileged classes, is expressed in a speech delivered by Mr. Disraeli in June 1848, on a motion by Mr. Hume in favour of Reform. It was repeated in July 1860, in opposition to Mr. Locke King's Bill for the reduction of the County Franchise, in the following words :—

'I always believed and supposed that every gentleman, whatever his opinion may be of the proper franchise for England or Ireland, considered that the constitution of England was a monarchy, modified by estates of the realm, that is, by privileged classes, who are invested with those privileges for the advantage of the community.'

It was reiterated by himself in the debate on Lord Grosvenor's motion on the 27th of April last, as also by Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Hugh Cairns. The predominance of this idea of the representation of estates, orders, or classes becomes still more plainly apparent in Mr. Disraeli's own efforts at Reform. It furnishes the most summary reason for the exclusion of the working, or of any other classes, from the franchise. It inspires the attempts to give a more direct representation to interests, to handicap classes, to sever the towns from the counties of which they are component parts, to make one set of constituencies consist of purely agricultural elements, others of those immediately engaged in different pursuits. It may be traced all through his proposals or intimations on Lateral Reform, the revision of boundaries, the division of counties, the groupings of boroughs. Even when he appears to allow the claims of personal fitness to the franchise, and speaks boldly of not stopping to count the numbers to be admitted to that privilege, it will be found that he confines himself to such persons as are within the pale of a favoured class. When he argues for giving representation to some particular place, it is not so much on the ground of the general character and importance of that place, as that it is in the hands of, and identical with, a single interest.

It must, however, be evident that to give effect to the idea, wholly or in part, would be a retrograde step, not one in advance. The summoning of estates by the sovereigns of mediæval Europe was but the rudimentary form out of which Parliaments have grown. Each estate was summoned for matters that specially concerned itself, or to vote its own particular subsidies. The notion of a national representation, for the consideration of imperial interests, was a later development. Just in proportion as Mr. Disraeli's principle was acted upon, would the British Parliament be assimilated to a Swedish Diet, in which separate orders—the gentry, the clergy, the peasants, and the burgesses—appear by separate representatives. Mr. Hare has propounded an ingenious scheme for obtaining unanimous constituencies composed of individuals having no acquaintance or common bond with each other, but only fortuitously concurring in the pursuit of the same private interest, or in the holding of the same theories. The Reform League preach the doctrine that a numerical majority of adult males, omitting considerations of moral worth, of intellectual capacity, or of property, has a divine right to empire. The United States have established a system of electoral districts with ever-shifting boundaries and an ever-varying population; but the theory of representation of estates or classes, consis-

tently acted upon, would be no less at variance with the principles and practice of our Constitution, as expanded and perfected by time, than any of the above devices.

Representation in the English Parliament has always been that of Localities, or, more properly, of Local Communities, each containing a mixture of classes and interests. Incidentally, inasmuch as in different localities different interests and different classes preponderate, all of any weight or consequence obtain, or should obtain, a voice. But there is an incalculable advantage in this indirect representation of classes and of interests. Every single member of the House, though he will incline to, and be more especially the organ of the class or interest that predominates in his constituency, yet is not the representative of that alone; he is, from the composite nature of the body that returns him, continually called upon to consider, and to reckon with, a number of other classes and interests. A direct collision of interests is thus avoided, while the same cause operates to retain to members the character of representatives, and saves them from being reduced to the lower level of delegates.

It is, however, an indispensable condition of such a system that the electoral communities should be so numerous, so diffused over the surface of the country, as to present that diversity of character which is necessary to prevent monotony in the representation. It would be fatal that the number of electoral bodies should be materially reduced, and long tickets of members returned by comparatively few constituencies, however large and important. More particularly would this be the case, if a considerable portion of these few constituencies, instead of having an extended area, consisted of the concentrated and more homogeneous populations of large towns.

No great and important communities should long be suffered to remain unrepresented, and in their favour decaying boroughs should be extinguished. We would disfranchise without mercy venal or servile constituencies. But we would not wage a war of extermination, on purely arithmetical grounds, against incorrupt and independent electoral bodies. It must never be forgotten that the representation of communities necessarily involves those inequalities of wealth and of population which so shock mathematical reformers who would have a Reform Bill turned out by a calculating machine, and who would count men by the head, or weigh them in the scale, as if they were sacks of corn or bales of cotton or of tobacco. So long, then, as constituencies are numerous and diversified, classes and interests may as a rule, and indeed should, be left to find their own

natural level; and the main point to be aimed at is, that every man qualified by his intelligence, and his interest in the stability of order and the well-being of the country, should have a vote in that locality or community with which he has cast in his lot. What, however, if there should be one class or interest so overwhelmingly preponderant in numbers throughout the whole country, that, under any widely extended suffrage, it would be in a decided majority in every constituency? Such it is apprehended might prove to be the case with those who live by manual labour; and notwithstanding the diversity of their pursuits, tastes, and characters, we are far from disputing that there is a sufficient risk of this danger to induce men in responsible positions to proceed with every caution.

Here, then, we have arrived at a stage in which the consideration of class is forced upon us; and this it is which gave truth and point to the taunt of Conservative debaters last session, that the late Government had themselves made Reform a question of class. But the broad distinction is not to be overlooked, that with the one party the consideration of class is exceptional and secondary, with the other it is the primary consideration.

In the debates of last session, and at other times, Conservatives have expressed themselves, in general terms, willing to admit the *élite*, or a considerable body of the working classes, to the franchise. But in practice, true to the doctrine of privileged classes, they have made no attempt to enfranchise them. 'It 'would have been a feeble, a dangerous, and a foolish policy to 'propose 20*l.* in counties and a 6*l.* rating franchise in boroughs,' said Mr. Disraeli in 1859, when defending his Reform Bill against two of his own colleagues. 'We deemed it,' he repeated on the 27th of April last, 'dangerous to reduce the borough 'franchise.' The Tory Reform Bill in 1859 accordingly met the crucial difficulty of Reform, how to admit many, but not too many, working men to the franchise, by refusing to admit any. More than that, the effect of the measure would have been, by an increased enfranchisement of the more favoured interests, since known as 'lateral Reform,' to diminish the influence now enjoyed by labourers in the constituencies. In an address to the Buckinghamshire electors, issued as a party manifesto, before the last general election, Mr. Disraeli adhered to this policy, and asserted that the then House of Commons had 'declared by a large majority that the franchise 'in boroughs should not be lowered, and that the principle on 'which Lord Derby wished to extend it was the just one.' The Tory measure of 1859 not only made all safe by exclud-

ing the artisans in towns from the benefit of its provisions, but further proposed to sort out the 'privileged orders,' and to establish an artificial balance of power between them. With this object its authors did not hesitate to dissect our natural constituencies, regardless of the sacrifice of their character and identity as local communities. They proposed to emasculate the counties by removing a most valuable element of independence and of variety, the freeholders voting for property situate in parliamentary boroughs which are integral parts of the county. Their proposed revision of boundaries, whether of large towns or of small boroughs, evidently was based upon the same fundamental idea, and had no reference to those limits which common rights, powers, and institutions spontaneously mark out. In the same spirit, Mr. Disraeli has more lately thrown out the suggestion of eliminating the unrepresented towns from the counties, and forming them into electoral colleges consisting of purely urban voters; while the rural parishes should be fenced off as preserves for the great landowners. Consistent also with the same theory is the plan indicated in debate last year by Sir John Pakington and others, and recently set forth in an able pamphlet by Mr. Cole.* According to this scheme, if an increased number of working men are to receive votes, a limited number of towns should be assigned to them as cities of refuge. Moreover, in these, the wage-earners, or all below a certain limit of taxation, should be erected into a separate constituency from their fellow-townsmen, and return a Tribune of the Plebeians, or a Poor-man's Member, exclusively their own. The plan, no doubt, recommends itself by the ingenuity with which it facilitates the giving to the unenfranchised the maximum of votes, with the minimum, not only of actual representation, but of electoral influence.

Diametrically opposed to the doctrine of 'Estates' are the opinions advocated by the Reform League, and countenanced by the member for Birmingham. In direct contradiction to Coningsby, Mr. Bright asserts that the House of Commons is of right the House of the People; the Representative of the Nation, not of some privileged order. The consideration of classes and interests, even that of communities—every consideration in fact—vanishes before the one paramount claim of individuals to equal political power. According to the more moderate school of democracy, to which Mr. Bright professes his adherence

* The Middle Classes and the Borough Franchise. By Henry Warwick Cole, Q.C. Longmans, 1866.

without repudiating the other, this claim arises from a personal fitness. Concerning the best test or measure of this fitness opinions differ. Most of those, however, who practically entertain the question, point to some degree of household suffrage. The more advanced school assumes the franchise to be a birthright, and discards all consideration of personal qualifications; unless, perhaps, in extreme cases of individuals who by crime, or some exceptional defect, may be held to have forfeited their original title.

We need scarcely say that, as Constitutional Liberals, we do not concur in the doctrines of democracy, whether native, or imported from the great transatlantic republic, which is so continually held up to us as a model or as a warning; although, owing to differences of territory, of history, and of national character, the lessons to be derived from it are much less applicable to our circumstances than regenerators on the one hand, or alarmists on the other, would have us to suppose. Neither do we concur in the doctrine of a Third Estate made up of privileged orders. On the contrary, we hold it to be unsound in principle and dangerous in practice. It places a ban of exclusion upon entire classes. If a direct representation is to be given to the agricultural, or any other, interest as such, it is impossible to say where, in our complex society, the process should stop. If constituencies are for this purpose to be cut up and cast into a Medea's caldron, to be remoulded on some new system, the temptation in so doing to manipulate them for party objects will prove irresistible. Our hope and our wish is to see a measure of Reform, both as regards the right of voting and the assignment of seats, conceived in the spirit and framed 'upon the lines of our ancient Constitution.'

Doubtless, however, the favourite resource of last session—that of affecting to confound and identify the whole Liberal party with the most extreme democrats—will again be resorted to. The leader of the Tories himself did not disdain to employ this mode of attack against his great antagonist in the House of Commons. We quote his words on April 27th as a specimen of the opposition directed against Mr. Gladstone, not merely by irresponsible partisans, but by grave senators:—

'The Right Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) says, "only 400,000 are introduced by our Bill, while there are 4,500,000 of living and breathing men, citizens like ourselves, payers of taxes like ourselves, bound to every civil duty like ourselves, having an interest in the peace and order of the country like ourselves." Very well, but the object of discussion is to elicit truth. What is the interpretation to be put upon this? I say—every man of candour must say

—there is only one interpretation—that the 4,500,000 have as much right to be added to the constituent body, or to exercise the franchise, although it may be prudent for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to propose that only 400,000 shall at present "be brought within the pale of the Constitution." But if you admit the principle that the 4,500,000 behind them have an equal right to enter the English Constitution, you are introducing American principles which must be fatal to this country, though they may be adapted to America. I say, therefore, that no other interpretation can be put upon the language of the Right Hon. Gentleman; but if there were any doubt, that doubt can remain no longer. Remember the speech he made a year-and-a-half ago, which confounded his colleagues, confused the House, and perplexed and agitated the country, when he based the title of admission to the suffrage upon the rights of man.'

Mr. Disraeli could not, with the Bill of last session open before him, charge Mr. Gladstone with any overt act of democracy, but he charged him with thinking democracy. The favourite allegation against Mr. Gladstone has been a single expression taken apart from its context in his speech on Mr. Baines's Bill in 1864. This speech is, we are glad to find, republished in the Appendix to the Speeches of 1866, and we quote from it the passage referred to:—

'I venture to say that every man who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger is morally entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution. Of course in giving utterance to such a proposition, I do not recede from the protest I have previously made against sudden, or violent, or excessive, or intoxicating change; but I apply it with confidence to this effect, that fitness for the franchise when it is shown to exist—as I say it is shown to exist in the case of a select portion of the working classes—is not repelled on sufficient grounds from the portals of the Constitution by the allegation that things are well as they are.' (*Gladstone Speeches*, p. 332.)

The passage appears to us to embody the leading idea upon which Reform ought to proceed, and upon which we hope it will proceed. The House of Commons is not treated therein as a Diet or Assembly of Estates, for the claims of personal fitness are recognised. On the other hand the democratic principle of representation is excluded, for the claims of personal fitness are, if need be, postponed and made subordinate to considerations of possible political danger, 'such as,' Mr. Gladstone has deliberately added in a written preface to his speech, 'the disturbance of the equilibrium of the constituent body, or the virtual monopoly of power by a single class.'

The much abused and much misquoted speech of 1864 expresses a general principle which admits of being applied within such narrow limits and with so many safeguards as practically to satisfy the most timid Conservative, while it raises no barrier to such changes as time and circumstances may hereafter require. In what degree Mr. Gladstone would apply it in our own time and generation is apparent from the avowed scope and object of the Bill he introduced last session, from his speeches upon that Bill, and from his letters to the London Working Men's Association, to Mr. Hugessen, and to Mr. Horsfall, all of which will be found in the Appendix to the Speeches of 1866.

We have entered at such length upon the engrossing question of the day that we have left ourselves little time or space for the consideration of other subjects, but we cannot refrain from a few observations upon two of the most important, viz. foreign affairs and the state of Ireland. The appointment of Lord Stanley affords a presumption, almost a guarantee, that the Tory Government does not contemplate a Tory Foreign policy. Indeed the chief organ of the Conservatives in the press with great *naïveté* pointed this out when the noble Lord assumed the office which Lord Clarendon had declined to continue to hold in the new Administration. Lord Stanley's speech to his constituents on his re-election, still more his character and antecedents, are calculated to inspire confidence. It is surely a symptom of a change in the spirit of Conservative dreams that Lord Derby should at the Mansion House have congratulated his hearers on the triumph of Italian unity, that a Cabinet in which Lord Cranbourne sits should be disposed to entertain the Alabama claims. In the recent convulsions on the Continent, however important their results, there could be no question of England being other than a spectator. Excepting the effects of Fenianism upon questions between ourselves and the United States—questions which Lord Stanley approaches with advantages Lord Russell's Government could not enjoy—there is nothing immediate in the condition of our relations abroad to tax or to test the energies and abilities of the Foreign Office. Nevertheless our Foreign policy is in a state of transition which calls for the utmost care and attention on the part of the Minister charged with its conduct.

Mr. Seward in one of his despatches to Mr. Adams during the civil war in America speaks of Great Britain as having in recent times 'changed character and purpose.' In his view, 'she has become a power for production, rather than a power 'for destruction. She is committed, as it seems to us, to a

'policy of industry, not of ambition; a policy of peace, not of 'war. One has only to compare her present domestic condi- 'tion with that of any former period to see that this new 'career on which she has entered is as wise as it is humane 'and beneficent.'

There is great truth in the above observations, and we sincerely and heartily rejoice in their truth. But any Minister, of our own or of any other country, would greatly err who should presume too much upon a patient endurance by England of wrong or of insult, or upon a withdrawal on her part from concern in international questions. We will not now discuss the difference between intervention as applied to the internal affairs of a foreign state, and to questions arising between independent powers; we will not imply with Talleyrand, that non-intervention is only another term for intervention; but we may point out, that it is by no means, as appears to be often assumed, identical with isolation. The fact is that, till of late years, questions of foreign policy were little understood or considered by the English people, which on such subjects was guided by sentiment rather than by reason. The Foreign Office, mainly owing to this circumstance, grew up less immediately amenable to the House of Commons and to the nation than other departments of State. The Government thus acquired an almost uncontrolled conduct of foreign affairs, and only when an emergency arose appealed to the passions, to the generous impulses, and the chivalry of the country to support it. In recent times, owing to closer intercourse with other states, and to increased facilities of information, an intelligent public opinion upon foreign questions has been gradually springing up. The country will more and more refuse to embark in wars arising out of negotiations or treaties to which it was committed, perhaps many years before, by Ministers whom loss of power, or the hand of death, has removed from all responsibility, and about which, at the time of their being entered into, it received little information or felt no concern. This feeling most plainly appeared in the debate upon the Dano-German affairs. Its emphatic assertion was, in our opinion, a great lesson to Governments, and a result of even greater consequence than any of the immediate issues involved in the vote then taken. This progress of opinion must undoubtedly lead to greater publicity, and more caution, in the conduct of foreign relations. It will, it may be hoped, contribute greatly to check meddlesome interference in word or in deed with matters that do not materially concern us and tend to the preservation of peace. If, however, any question should

arise upon which the intelligent conviction of the country went along with its sense of right, of interest, or of honour, we believe it would be found that England would feel more keenly, and act with more resolution than ever, and, in an adequate cause, would sternly brave the worst.

Our policy at the present time should aim at holding the country unfettered by pledges, and unentangled by engagements. Without proclaiming non-intervention as an axiom, it should be animated by a strong indisposition to interfere in political affairs abroad. It should make peace its object, but not forget that which every school-boy well knows, that to imbue others with a belief that no provocation will induce you to fight, is not the way to secure peace. It should labour to promote commerce, as a great good in itself, as an instrument of yet higher good by serving to extinguish past prejudices and present passions, and as, it may be hoped, the pioneer of a system of international relations based upon reason and upon morality. We believe that Lord Stanley, both from temperament and from reflection, is averse to that policy of brute force and of quixotism with which the greatness of the Tory party is traditionally associated, and the vitality of which irrepressibly crops out on occasions. Left to himself, if he errs at all, he will err rather on the side of abstaining from asserting, or failing to assert with sufficient energy, the rights and interests of England, in some case calling for promptitude and vigour. But we cannot forget the difficulties of his position, or that, on former occasions, Lord Stanley has suffered himself to be overruled by those among whom he sits, and betrayed into steps which his candour of mind and habitual calmness of judgment must in ordinary circumstances have disapproved. The Opposition should remit none of its vigilance in respect of foreign affairs, and be prepared, if need be, to strengthen the hands of the youthful Minister in negotiations abroad or against obstacles nearer home.

'The men now in office cannot govern Ireland,' was Mr. Bright's declaration in the autumn. If they do not find it impossible, they will find it one of the most difficult of their tasks. From traditional antipathies, from long years of misrule, an incurable chronic discontent has been engendered in Ireland. Fenianism is not to be appeased by the reform of genuine abuses or the removal of sentimental grievances, but only by revolution, if at all. The abolition of the Established Church would do nothing to satisfy the cravings of Fenianism. The Fenians probably know little about education, religious or secular, and care nothing about colleges and universities,

about charters and degrees. Proposals to make the Government a land-jobber, to invert the policy of the Encumbered Estates Act by buying up at a premium the land of owners having capital in order to resell it to those who have none, touch not the Fenian mind. 'Could we not have it for nothing?' is the view of these simple-minded political economists. Nevertheless, it is the existence of real abuses and imaginary wrongs that makes it possible for Fenianism to strike root in Irish soil. It may well be asked, What would Englishmen say if they saw in any other country a National Church Establishment defended only by its champions on the plea that it was a missionary—that is, an aggressor upon the religion of the nation; a Church moreover equipped for its mission by the appropriation of the religious property of those whom it seeks to convert? What would be said of a system of education which, however just and reasonable in itself, is foreign to the habits and abhorrent to the religious sentiments of those to whom it is offered? What of whole provinces of which the staple industry is agriculture, yet in which the laws regulating the tenure and cultivation of land are opposed to the sense of right, and at variance with the traditions of the people? History abounds in instances of demands out of reason being terminated by concessions in reason. Italy affords the latest instance. The independence of Italy has not satisfied the aspirations of Mazzinianism, but it has quenched them. The unity of Italy has not gratified the animosity of Roman republicanism against ecclesiastics, but it may prove the means of extinguishing it. Yet the case of Italy was more extreme than that of Ireland. Discontent in Italy was native-born, and pervaded every rank in life. Fenianism in Ireland is of foreign importation, and disloyalty, however rife among ignorance and poverty, has not extended to property, to education, or to religion.

The recent change of Government may prove an additional source of danger and of misfortune to Ireland. The statesman-like wisdom, the decision, and the nerve by which Lord Kimberley signalised his administration are recognised by all. The period was a most critical one, yet the late Government in Ireland was more trusted than any of its predecessors. It was believed earnestly to intend a policy of conciliation, not one merely of concession and of favouritism. It was felt that the law would be firmly but impartially administered. Not a complaint was heard of the strict fairness with which the trials of the conspirators were conducted. Irrespective of rank and of religion, all the elements of order, all the intelligence of the

nation, seemed disposed to work cordially in unison. The accession of the Tories to office produced a feeling of reaction and discouragement. So far as measures of repression are unfortunately necessary, the Tories will, no doubt, adequately perform their part. But their antecedents, and the auspices under which they have assumed the reins of power, are not favourable. Their well-known Orange propensities repel those moderate and national Roman Catholics who must ever be the most effectual counterpoise to Ultramontane and foreign influences. Their tendencies to class-legislation, in a country of which class-legislation has been the bane, present themselves most inopportunely, at a time when it is all-important to convince Ireland that England has no other object at heart than to do justice to, and promote the prosperity of, the whole population. To us, who feel convinced that to heal Ireland's grievances would add more to the might of the Empire than 'reconstructed' fleets or 'reorganised' armies; who believe that to make Ireland cease to be a sore and a reproach would do more to raise Great Britain in the eyes of foreign nations, and to give her weight in the councils of the world, than all the arts of diplomatists and statesmen can compass, whatever damps that conviction or retards its realisation cannot but appear in the light of a national calamity.

Since the close of the session not a few Liberal speakers and writers have pointed exultingly to the position of the present Cabinet, as being one in which they must either shrink from Reform and destroy their Government, or embrace Reform and break up their party. How they may escape from the dilemma, if it be one, is not our affair. But it behoves the Liberals, especially those in Parliament, thoroughly to comprehend and realise the dangers and difficulties of their own position. Last year, starting with the fairest auspices, they wrecked the party and stranded its policy. If now, through sectional feuds, through personal jealousies, or through general supineness, they allow great questions to be trifled with, or the friends of reaction to prevail, the constituencies will mark the dereliction of trust. If through factious impatience, or a not unnatural spirit of retaliation, they reject sound measures or grasp at power without showing strictly fair, and even generous, dealing towards their rivals, the country will judge them. Whether the Conservatives be destined to hold office for a longer or a shorter period, it should be the aim of all who really hold Liberal opinions—who are true friends to progress, and disposed to advance in the same direction—to unite to defend and promote the common policy. If an early measure of Reform be not

only, as we believe, desirable, but have become needful, it may be hoped that those who seceded from the Liberal body, only because they deemed Reform at the time inopportune or uncalled for, will accept the position, and content themselves with having procured a delay for further consideration. We trust that those cautious Liberals who stretched a point to support the Bill of last session, the bolder Liberals who for their part made no less a concession in adopting it, will be equally prepared, when occasion arises, to accept a measure conceived in the same spirit of compromise and of conciliation, a measure at once straightforward and substantial, yet limited by prudence and a due regard for the present holders of the franchise.

Who may be the chief destined to lead once more an united Liberal party to victory is a question which the future alone can solve. We are not unmindful of the long and illustrious antecedents of not a few who stand foremost in the ranks of Liberal statesmen. We would gladly see the party united under such a headship as past services to country and to party point out as eminently entitled to the high position. But neither the experience of age nor the impetuosity of genius are infallible guides in a new state of affairs, and in critical times patriotism and loyalty to a cause may require that personal pretensions should yield to expediency and the general good. To the consideration of each and all of the distinguished statesmen referred to, may be commended the spirit of the words uttered by the gallant Conservative chief, in July last, in regard to his own position and the peculiar difficulties that beset his cause:—

'My Lords, if I could for a moment have seen any other leader, who, while keeping the Conservative party together, was more likely than myself to obtain the adhesion of a portion of the Liberal ranks, I say, without hesitation, that I would have rejoiced, and been relieved, to have handed over to that leader, whoever he might be, a post which he might have been more able to fill.'

No. CCLVI. will be published in April.

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1867.

No. CCLVI.

ART. I. — *Mémoires du Comte Beugnot, Ancien Ministre* (1783—1815). Publiés par le Comte ALBERT BEUGNOT, son petit-fils. Deux tomes. Paris: 1866.

THE reminiscences of a man of spirit and intelligence, who had seen the condition of French society before the Revolution of 1789—who shared and survived the dangers of 1793—who took an active part in the Imperial administration under Napoleon—and a still more active part in the restoration of the Bourbons and the establishment of constitutional monarchy in France, are amongst the most instructive and entertaining memorials of modern history. We opened these volumes with high expectations, which have not been disappointed. They are really a valuable addition to the literature of the French Revolution; and they supply many of those happy touches and characteristic incidents which serve to complete the picture of that extraordinary period. Portions of these memoirs had already appeared in the 'Revue Française' of 1838, and the 'Revue Contemporaine' of 1852; indeed the additions now made to these fragments are not large, and it appears that the remainder of M. Beugnot's autobiographical papers, to which allusion is frequently made by himself, are no longer in existence. The memoirs therefore retain their fragmentary character, and, for once, we are assured that we possess them in their true form. This can so rarely be said of the French memoirs of the day, that we must express our gratitude to the Beugnot family that they have not allowed any hired hand to 'make up' or mutilate their literary inheritance. They have published whatever had come down to them, without any attempt to supply gaps or invent transitions. These volumes appear under the sanction of the highly respectable

name of the author's grandson; and although the highly epigrammatic and dramatic style in which they are written might awaken some suspicions, yet we believe in their authenticity and credibility.*

Memoirs may be divided into two great classes—those which are really contemporary, with all the fluctuations and contradictions of current opinion, and those which are recast afterwards when the events to which they relate are terminated. A writer with the graphic powers of a Saint-Simon may by the latter pro-

* A recent example of this most reprehensible practice of dressing up memoirs has come under our notice, which is so extraordinary that we feel bound to comment upon it. A volume appeared not long ago in Paris, entitled '*Anne-Paule-Dominique de Noailles*, '*Marquise de Montagu*,' purporting to be an authentic memoir of that amiable woman, the fourth daughter of the Duc d'Ayen, and a sister of Madame de Lafayette. Nothing could be more interesting and affecting than this narrative of her blameless and heroical life. It was originally printed as a 'recueil de souvenirs qui n'était point 'destiné au public,' by the children of Madame de Montagu, and with the sanction of the illustrious House of Noailles. The facts and details were stated to be taken from the journal of Madame de Montagu herself, or from her correspondence with her sisters. 'On 'ne peut avoir,' say the editors, 'd'éléments plus certains et plus 'sincères pour raconter la vie de quelqu'un, et pour se faire une 'idée de ce qui la compose et de ce qui l'entoure.' We know from the best authority that these statements are true, as far as the materials of the work are concerned; but unfortunately they were placed in the hands of a person who grossly abused the confidence of the Noailles family.

It would be incredible if the fact had not been proved in an action at law brought against the Duc de Noailles to recover an additional payment, that this work was prepared for the press by a profligate hireling named Auguste Callet, who by his own showing is as great an impostor as is to be met with in literary history. This person asserted before the Tribunal Civil de la Seine on the 7th July 1865, that the book in question was *composed and written by himself;* that the journal kept by Madame de Montagu had been destroyed, and was only represented by fragments of an imperfect copy, and that the authentic materials in existence were insufficient to produce more than a few pages of biography; that, accordingly, M. Callet had been reduced to conjecture, and had *invented* many of the most striking and affecting incidents in the book. Callet failed in his action, for the Court held that he had been already sufficiently paid for his fraud, and that his object was to extort money to which he had no legal claim, by making it known. But this circumstance has materially shaken the confidence with which the book was received, and we regret that these statements have not been publicly confuted by the Noailles family.

cess leave to posterity a more complete picture of a great reign, or may, with the sedate wisdom of Count Mollieu in his invaluable records of the First Empire, raise his personal reminiscences to the dignity of history. But in point of vivacity and reality nothing can make up for the freshness of a recent impression. We feel in the present tense, though we reflect in the præter-perfect. And the nearer a writer can bring us to the scenes he is describing, the more completely does he master our sympathy and our interest.

M. Beugnot was born in 1761 at Bar-sur-Aube, where his family belonged to the *noblesse de robe* of the province, and he himself was brought up to fill a legal office before the Revolution. He gives us no details, however, as to his early life, and the narrative of his adventures begins with a relation of his curious acquaintance with the notorious Madame de Lamotte. It seemed extremely improbable that anything more remained to be said of the affair of the Diamond Necklace—that scandalous intrigue which had so disastrous an effect on the fortunes of Marie Antoinette. But, as Madame Campan observes, of all the enemies of the Queen, this Lamotte was destined to be the worst; and a cabal which originated in vanity, lust, and avarice—in which Marie Antoinette had no part but that of a victim—was more injurious to her than her own social failings or political errors. Madame de Lamotte was probably the authoress of the whole plot, unless indeed she was aided in it by the sinister genius of Cagliostro. By a strange series of accidents, M. Beugnot, himself one of the most honest of men, was in the company of this woman at the most critical moments of her life, and might, on less evidence, have been thought to be implicated in her villany.

It must have been about the year 1765, that M. Beugnot's father, going his rounds to levy the *taille* in the country near Bar-sur-Aube, was entreated by the curé of the parish of Fontete to relieve three children who were starving in a wretched hovel by the roadside. These children, a boy and two girls, were the last descendants of an illegitimate branch of the House of Valois, through a Baron de St. Rémi who was a natural son of King Henry II. Their father, in spite of his high lineage, was no better than a tramp, who lived by poaching and robbing orchards. But his pedigree was incontestable and had been accepted by Chérin, the court genealogist of Louis XV. Moved by the extreme distress of these children, an effort was made by Beugnot, the elder, to provide for them in the neighbourhood. He himself gave them some money. The Bishop of Langres protected them. The King at last bestowed on the

boy a pension of 1,000 livres, and an admission to the Naval School of France. The girls were put to school at the Abbey of Longchamps near Paris, and so the last descendants of the Valois were brought back to civilised life. The boy, called the Baron de Valois, entered the navy and honourably lost his life in action. The girls were destined to take religious vows; but their vocation was so small, that when the subject was broached they ran away from Longchamps, and found their way back with six livres in their pocket in 1782 to Bar-sur-Aube, where young Beugnot was then just beginning to make a figure in the world. It is evident that he was not a little taken with the elder of the young ladies, to the great alarm of his father, who regretted that he had ever dug them out of the hovel by the roadside. A benevolent lady of Bar-sur-Aube, Madame de Surmont, shocked at the destitute condition of these young persons of quality, invited them to her house; they stayed there a year, and the eldest young lady, who might have sat for the moral traits of Mr. Thackeray's 'Becky Sharp,' began her operations on mankind by making her ascendancy felt in the house of this hospitable protectress, and marrying her nephew, M. de Lamotte, who was then serving in the gend'armerie of the department. The happy pair had nothing to live on but their wits; and while the bride despatched her husband to reclaim the missing estates of the House of Valois, she lost no time herself in repairing to Paris. The portrait of this terrible adventuress is not ill drawn by M. Beugnot.

'Madame de Lamotte was not what is called beautiful; she was low in stature, but well-formed; her eyes were blue, full of expression, and shaded by dark rounded eyebrows. Her face was rather long, with a good mouth and excellent teeth; and the peculiar stamp of her kind—a bewitching smile. Her hand was good, her foot small; her complexion remarkably fair. She had learnt nothing, but she had plenty of talent and penetration. As she had been contending from her birth against the whole order of society, she set its laws at defiance and those of morality as well. She passed clean over them all, as if she never suspected their existence. A character such as hers is a frightful spectacle to an observing eye, but seductive enough to the common run of men who do not look at things so closely.' (P. 12.)

Meanwhile young Beugnot had come up to Paris for his legal studies, and he soon received a visit from this interesting client. He looked up for her the old patent of Henry II. in the archives which had settled these estates on her ancestor, wrote a memorial in support of her claims, paid a bill for her

several times over at the Hotel de Reims, and prevailed on her once or twice a week to dine with him at the *Cadran Bleu*. On other days they took a walk together, which generally ended in a café.

'The lady had a singular love of beer, and no beer came amiss to her. She would eat, out of pure inadvertence, two or three dozen tartlets; and these inadvertences were so frequent that I could not but perceive that she had dined very lightly, if at all.'

However, this state of depression soon came to an end. She announced one day that Madame de Boulainvilliers had obtained for her the honour of an audience of the Cardinal de Rohan, and Beugnot lent her his carriage to go there. 'I must have 'it,' said she, 'for in this country there are but two ways to go 'begging, either at the church door or in a coach and pair.' The results of that visit were memorable in all history. The Cardinal, himself a profligate and an adventurer in his way, was completely subdued by the grace and address of the fair supplicant. It is certain from a collection of letters from him to the Lamotte, which were luckily destroyed by Beugnot after his arrest, that he was madly in love with her; and from that moment her progress in the path of vice, guilt, and success was rapid. She therefore smilingly informed her friend Beugnot (still at the *Cadran Bleu*) that he could no longer be of any use to her. But in this she was mistaken. For a time, however, he withdrew from her society, and she transferred her operations to Versailles, where she succeeded in making the acquaintance of persons about the Court who had already practised on the Queen. It soon became evident that she had made her fortune and lost her character; but with singular impudence she and her husband came back to pay a visit to their old friends at Bar-sur-Aube (who received them at first very coldly) with a splendid equipage, a profusion of money, and all the luxury of a great lady—accessories which speedily led people to take a more favourable view of their condition.

Madame de Lamotte's house in Paris in the following year was not less brilliant and agreeable; and there Beugnot, at his own request, met Cagliostro—a worthy member of such a company.

'The great mountebank seemed cut in the very mould of *Signor Tulifano* (the Dulcamara of that day) on the Italian stage—short, stout, olive-coloured, with eyes half out of his head, and a broad turned-up nose. He wore that day an iron-grey single-breasted coat embroidered with gold, a scarlet waistcoat with rich lace, red breeches, his sword under the tails of his coat, and a broad hat

with a white feather—looking very like those drug-sellers and tooth-drawers who perform at fairs. But Cagliostro raised the character of his dress by his lace ruffles, sparkling rings, and shoe-buckles looking very much like diamonds. I still looked askance at him, hardly knowing what he was like, but in spite of myself, the whole aspect of the man had something imposing about it, and I wanted to hear him talk. His language was a strange mish-mash of Italian and French, with numerous quotations, which he gave us to understand were Arabic, but which he did not translate. He alone talked—he could touch on as many subjects as he pleased, as nobody else had anything to say about them. Every moment he looked round the table, and begged to know if he was understood; at which everybody round the table bowed assent. When he began a subject he raised his voice as if he were inspired, and then dropped into a tone of gallantry and ludicrous compliment. This lasted all supper-time, but all I understood was that the hero had been talking of the sky, the stars, the Grand Arcanum, Memphis, the hierophant, transcendental chemistry, giants, big beasts; of a city bigger than Paris in the interior of Africa, where he had numerous correspondents; of our ignorance of a thousand things which he had at his fingers' ends; and of the charms of Madame de Lamotte, whom he called his dove, his gazelle, his swan, &c. After supper he honoured me with a round of questions, but as I contented myself with humbly expressing my own ignorance, I was afterwards assured by Madame de Lamotte that he had conceived the most favourable impression of my person and my attainments.

'I returned home on foot and alone. It was one of those nights of spring, when the moon seems to lend the softness of her light to the promise of the coming year. The town was quiet and solitary, as it commonly is in the Marais after midnight. I stopped in the Place Royale to meditate on the scene which had just passed before me. I thought with bitterness of mankind, when I saw to what depths of extravagance men sated with all the gifts of fortune and society may descend. I thought with compassion of that wretched Cardinal de Rohan, whom Cagliostro and the Lamotte are, I see, driving to the abyss. But is my own curiosity so venial? What have I to do in this gilded cavern of people whom I despise and whom I ought to abhor? I contrasted these scenes with the early impressions of my father's house and of my studious years; and condemning my own weakness, I resolved to separate myself from Madame de Lamotte and her band without a rupture, but altogether.' (P. 62.)

A more illustrious victim than the Cardinal de Rohan was threatened by these machinations, and by a curious accident Beugnot was again thrown into Madame de Lamotte's company at a most decisive moment. He had gone to call one evening on a person from his own province whom Madame de Lamotte had made her companion. That lady herself was out, but as the evening wore away she returned, accompanied by her husband, her

secretary, and a remarkably handsome well-grown girl of about twenty-five. They were all in the highest spirits, the unknown beauty as well as the rest; and as supper was served and the wine went round, she became noisy. Villette (the secretary) said that 'it was not true that people were always betrayed by 'themselves; that everybody betrayed you; and that—' Here Madame de Lamotte, next whom he was sitting, put her hand to his mouth, and exclaimed, 'Hush! M. Beugnot is too 'honest a man to hear our secrets.' The conversation thus interrupted, Beugnot was sent home in Madame de Lamotte's carriage, accompanied by the tall young lady, whom he dropped on his way at the Rue de Cléry. That young lady was Mademoiselle Oliva, who had personated the Queen in the scene when she gave a rose to the Cardinal in the bosquet de Versailles. The trick had been played that very evening, and by this strange accident Beugnot had supped with the actors. From that moment the mystification of the Cardinal was complete, and the Diamond Necklace was in the grasp of the gang.

Strangely enough, after the extraordinary success of the plot, the Lamottes not only did not leave the country with their plunder, but they had the folly and audacity to return to Bar-sur-Aube, where they were well known, to exhibit it. They openly displayed enormous wealth. Waggons loaded with splendid furniture came down from Paris. Two complete services of plate glittered on the sideboard. They even exhibited a casket of diamonds of great value, and a multitude of costly articles of jewellery. All this was set down to the infatuation of the Cardinal, but it created distrust, and in the better houses of the province Madame de Lamotte was in very indifferent repute.

She still succeeded, however, in pushing herself into society, and on the 17th of August 1785 she was even received by the Duc de Penthièvre at his seat at Châtauvilain, with honours only paid to persons of high rank. Beugnot was staying at that moment at the Abbey de Clairvaux, with Dom Rocourt the Abbot, a very strange successor of St. Bernard; the Abbé Maury was to preach next day the annual commemoration of that great saint at the monastery. Dom Rocourt was so good-looking that when he was presented at Versailles, the Queen called out, 'Ah! 'le beau moine!' and he was in other respects a well-appointed gentleman, having 400,000 francs a year, and never travelling without four horses and an outrider. With this gay abbot, in his abbey, Madame de Lamotte, on her way back from Châteauvilain, came to dine, and in her avowed character of the

mistress of a Prince of the Church, she seems to have thought she had a claim to figure at its ceremonies. This the Abbot declined, but he invited her to supper; and to this same supper arrived fresh from Paris the preacher of the morrow's feast. They sit down at once to table, and the Abbot, impatient of news from Court, challenges his guest for the last news from Versailles. 'What news?' replied Maury, 'where do you live 'then? There is news which astounds all Paris. The Car-'dinal de Rohan, High Almoner of France, was arrested last 'Tuesday, on Assumption Day, in his pontifical robes, at the 'door of the King's closet.' 'Is the cause of so violent a 'measure known?' 'Not exactly; but they say it is about a 'Diamond Necklace he was to have bought for the Queen, 'and did not buy. It is strange for such a trifle that they 'should have arrested the High Almoner of France.'

We continue the story in M. Beugnot's words:—

'No sooner had this news reached my ears, than I looked at Madame de Lamotte, who had dropped her napkin, whilst her pale and motionless face hung over her plate. After the first effort, she sprang up and rushed out of the room. One of the Abbot's attendants followed her, and I shortly rejoined her. She had already ordered her carriage and we started together. "Perhaps I was wrong to come away so abruptly," said she, "especially in presence of the Abbé Maury." "Not the least. Your relations with the Cardinal are known, and almost avowed. His life may be in danger; your part is to anticipate the letters, the couriers, the news. But what is the cause of his arrest?" "I can't conceive, unless it be some trick of Cagliostro's. The Cardinal is infatuated with that man, though I have never ceased to warn him." "Very well: but what is this affair of the necklace?" "All Cagliostro." "But you received the fellow at your house. Are you sure he has not compromised you?" "Not at all. I am sorry I left the supper. But there is nothing that fellow will not say." "Madame de Lamotte," rejoined I, "you have already said more than I care to hear; but I still offer to render you a last service. It is now ten o'clock. Your husband can join you in an hour with your valuables. You can reach Châlons to-night, whence you may gain the coast, and get a boat for ten louis to carry you to England." "Nonsense," she replied, "I have nothing to do with this affair." "At least," I added, after a silence of half an hour, "as soon as you get home, burn every paper which might compromise the Cardinal. You owe that to his honour and to your own safety." To this she assented, and on arriving at her apartment we at once opened a great box of sandal-wood filled with papers of every size and every colour. I asked her whether they contained any bank notes, and on her answering in the negative, I proposed to throw the whole into the fire. This she refused to do, and insisted on our going through all the papers. Then it was that I saw what ravages the delirium of love, rendered more intense by

the delirium of ambition, had wrought in this unhappy man. It is fortunate for the memory of the Cardinal that those letters were destroyed, though they would have formed a strange page in the history of human passions. But what must that age have been in which a Prince of the Church would not hesitate to write and to sign letters to a woman, whom he knew so little, which in our days no man with an atom of self-respect could even read to the end?

'I saw, too, in this box letters from Bohemer and Bossange speaking of the necklace, and of terms of payment; and threw all into the fire. The operation was a long one. When I left Madame de Lamotte her chamber was reeking with the smell of burnt paper and sealing-wax. It was then three in the morning. She promised to go to bed. But at four o'clock she was arrested, and at half-past four on her way to the Bastille.' (Vol. i. p. 86.)

Lamotte, the husband, effected his escape to England, no orders having been given to arrest him at the same time. The police, indeed, showed an extraordinary want of vigour in the whole affair. The arrest of the Cardinal took place at noon on the 15th of August. He at once denounced Madame de Lamotte as the authoress of the plot. Yet it was not till the 18th that she was taken at Bar-sur-Aube; and, as the warrant for the apprehension of her husband was sent down five days later, he had ample time to fly to England, and to carry off the diamonds which were the fruit of the robbery.*

Our limits forbid us to dwell on the sketches M. Beugnot has left us of the society of France at the outbreak of the Revolution; yet they are extremely characteristic. In spite of all the signs which announced the coming storm, it was impossible for the country-gentleman to believe it. Had not the King an army of 150,000 men to maintain order? What could persuade Dom Rocourt of Clairvaux that the Abbey and the Rule of St. Bernard were to be swept from the face of France? What could induce the great lady to believe that she was of less consequence in the vast medley of life than the daughter of an apothecary? When the danger became more apparent, Madame de Brionne, like many others of her rank, prepared to leave the country. The Bishop of Autun (Talleyrand) remonstrated with her, and advised her to take refuge in some small provincial town, where, if she lived quietly,

* The husband, who was known under the strange name of M. Mustiphragasis in his later years, died in Paris as late as the year 1831; but he had fallen into such extreme indigence that he was in the receipt of the charitable relief bestowed upon the poorest members of the community—in fact, he literally died a pauper.

no one would remark her. 'A small provincial town!' exclaimed the Marchioness—'no, M. de Périgord; paysanne tant qu'on 'voudra, *bourgeoise jamais!*' The whole country took up arms. The fear of brigands put a weapon into every man's hand. The manor-house was to be defended by a few rusty fowling-pieces. The game was swept off the country. The fish-ponds were dragged in front of the château. The tiers-état, in the form of three or four drunken peasants, assumed a sovereign jurisdiction over the roads. M. Beugnot witnessed these scenes with vexation and regret, but he was returned to the Legislative Assembly as the Deputy of Bar-sur-Aube, and played his part in the abortive work of that illustrious body.

His participation in the legislative labours of the Revolution did not, however, exempt him from its dangers. He had rendered himself obnoxious to the hatred of the revolutionary party by moving the decree of accusation against Marat; and early in 1793 he learned that a warrant had been issued for his apprehension. The only alternatives were imprisonment or flight. With patriotic confidence he chose the former, and resolved to abide the worst. He placed his money and his papers in the hands of a couple of friends, who robbed him; and putting 'Epictetus,' 'Marcus Aurelius,' and 'Thomas à Kempis' in a bundle with a few clean shirts, he prepared for the Conciergerie. At the moment of his seizure he wished to add a volume of 'Tasso' to his packet, but the title of 'Jerusalem Delivered' was regarded as suspicious. 'Tout ce qui vient de Jérusalem 'ne sent pas bon,' said the ruffian who had him in his power, and 'Tasso' was left behind. As he reached the entrance of the prison, the long steps of the Palais de Justice were crowded like an amphitheatre with ferocious wretches watching for the departure of the death-cart and the arrival of fresh victims. As he got down the whole mass rose screaming, clapping, and vociferating like cannibals. The hapless prisoner was pelted with nameless filth, and he might judge by his entry into the prison of what awaited him on leaving it.

His first three nights were spent in a dungeon with a murderer and a thief. It was by mistake he was placed there, but mistakes were common in the Conciergerie; and perhaps the company of the worst criminals underground was less perilous than that of the political victims up-stairs. Interest had, however, been made for him, and he was shortly transferred to the Infirmary, as the best part of the prison. Here the sick, the dying, and the dead were thrown pell-mell on some thirty or forty wretched beds—no air, no ventilation, no cleanliness—a brutal

doctor gave twenty minutes once a day to forty patients, and every form of outrage and suffering were heaped upon the miserable inmates of that den of horror. Yet here, and in an adjoining room, Beugnot found himself once more in the presence of friends with whom he had sat in the Legislative Assembly, and as his imprisonment was, by a rare exception, prolonged for four months, he may be said to have undergone the Reign of Terror in the very crucible of human suffering.

First came the Girondins. Seven of them shared his room. At two in the morning, on the 2nd of November, the gaolers entered the cell with torches, to make an inventory of their scanty possessions and sweep these illustrious victims away to judgment and the scaffold. Amongst these men, remarkable for the difference of their characters and the similarity of their fate, was Fauchet, the ex-Bishop of Calvados, who retained his attachment to the Catholic faith with the zeal of a martyr. Every day he read his breviary, a portion of Scripture, and a chapter of the Imitation of Jesus Christ. But his favourite study was the Apocalypse, for in that he fancied that St. John had predicted the Jacobin Club, the reign of Robespierre, the 'noyades' of Carrier, and even the 'carmagnoles' of Barère. Gensonné and Brissot listened with amazement to the fervour of his harangues.

Next came Bailly:—

'He entered the prison with a serenity worthy of one of the lights of the age. No complaint, no reproach, passed his lips in the six days on which he stood before that mock tribunal. He gave his answers to the end with the same coolness, precision, and dignity, though one's blood boils at the questions they put to him. No doubt especial orders had been given to make him drink of that bitter cup drop by drop; for, in the prison, where he had formerly brought the consolations of kindness and humanity, when he stood at the height of fortune and of fame, he was now treated with every refinement of barbarity. When the hour came for his attendance before the Court, his name was called out first, and, as he approached, the gaolers pushed him backwards and forwards, shrieking, "Tiens—voilà Bailly! à toi Bailly! prends donc Bailly!" he meanwhile moving with gravity through this dance of cannibals.

'The day before his death, Bailly anticipated what was to happen, and spoke of it without emotion. "The public has been misled about me," he said; "I hope the simple execution of the judgment will content them; but the police will keep order." "What," said I, "were you deceiving us by the tranquillity you showed, and the confidence you expressed?" "No," replied Bailly, "but I was giving you an example of never despairing of the laws of your country." The next morning early he took a cup of chocolate, and afterwards two cups of pure coffee. I expressed surprise at his taking the coffee upon the chocolate. "I took the chocolate," said

Bailly, "because it is nourishing and soothing, but as I have a difficult passage to make, and I distrust my own temperament, I took the coffee in addition, because it excites and stimulates me, and I hope with this diet I shall reach the end of my journey." At that moment his name was called, and for the last time I embraced him. He wished me a happier fate, and thanked me for the interest I had shown him.' (P. 199.)

One of the next victims in this strange group was Madame Roland, whose character and history we have delineated at some length in a recent Number of this Journal. M. Beugnot's impressions of that remarkable woman correspond with singular precision with those we had received from the re-perusal of her own Memoirs. There was much of harshness and extravagance in her devotion to the ideal of antique Stoicism, and her revolutionary opinions were odious to Beugnot. But in spite of the unfavourable prepossessions with which he saw her in that hall of Eblis, the grace and dignity with which she bore her misfortunes and prepared to meet her doom were irresistible.

'The day Madame Roland was to take her trial, Clavières sent me to her on some errand. I would have refused, but Clavières insisted, observing that an interview between her and himself on that day might be injurious to both of them. I went therefore, and watching the moment at which she left her room, I joined her as she passed. She waited at the bars till she was called. Her dress was careful; she wore a gown of white muslin, trimmed with blonde, and fastened round the waist by a sash of black velvet. Her hair was dressed; she wore a light and simple bonnet, and her beautiful locks fell waving on her shoulders. Her face seemed rather more animated than usual; her colour was lovely, and she had a smile upon her lips. With one hand she lifted the train of her gown, the other hand she surrendered to the crowd of women who surrounded her to kiss it. Those amongst them who best knew what awaited her sobbed aloud, and commended her to Providence. No words can describe that picture. Madame Roland answered them all with affectionate kindness; she did not promise them to return; she did not tell them she was going to die; but the last words she spoke to them were words of tender advice. She exhorted them to be united, to be brave, to hope, and to show the virtues which became their position. An old gaoler, named Fontenay, whose good heart had resisted for thirty years his harsh duties, cried as he opened the gate. I acquitted myself of Clavières' errand; she answered me briefly and with firmness. A phrase just begun was interrupted by the turnkey who summoned her into Court. At that signal, terrible for anyone but herself, she stopped, and taking me by the hand, she said, "Let us make it up, sir; the time is come." Raising her eyes to mine, she perceived I was struggling to repress my tears and was

extremely affected. She seemed touched by my sympathy, and added but two words, "Courage! courage!"' (Vol. i. p. 200.)

The women's quarter in the Conciergerie exhibited, even more than that occupied by the men, all the varied emotions of that extraordinary time. A corridor was common in the day-time to both sexes, and here there was as much dressing, talking, flirting, and love-making as in the salons of Paris. Most of the women contrived to change their dress three times a day, though in the interval they had often to wash or mend the garment they were about to put on. The tone of conversation was gay and animated, and people seemed bent on proving that though the Reign of Terror might imprison and kill them, it could not make them dull or disagreeable. All ranks of society were blended in this singular promenade, and it sometimes happened that those who had sunk to the lowest grade in life, rose again to dignity and honour at the near approach of death. When the Duc du Chatelet was brought to this prison he was totally unnerved by his position—a rare instance—and moreover he was intoxicated. The next day he recovered his senses but not his composure, and stood bewailing himself at the bars of the women's chamber. A poor girl of the town, named Églé, hardly twenty years old, who had been sent to prison because she hated and denounced the Revolution, said to this disconsolate nobleman, 'Fi-donc, Monsieur le Duc! are 'you crying? know, Sir, that this is a place where those who 'have no name may gain one; and those who have a name 'ought to know how to bear it.' The ruffian Chaumette had his eye on this girl, and proposed that she should be tried at the same time as Marie Antoinette and sent to the scaffold on the same tumbril. But even the monsters of that day recoiled from this execrable insult; the Queen was executed alone; and Églé was reserved for the next occasion. Three months elapsed, and if she had held her tongue she might have been forgotten, but her language was so violent that Fouquier resolved to make an end of her. The indictment which had previously been drawn up against her was still used on her trial, and she was literally condemned for having conspired with 'la Veuve 'Capet' against the liberties of the people. Eglé was proud of her indictment, but indignant at the detestable lies it contained with reference to the Queen. 'If they had sent me to the 'scaffold with her,' exclaimed the girl, 'they would have been 'preciously taken in.' 'How so?' said Beugnot. 'Why, in the 'middle of the street, I would have thrown myself at her feet, 'and neither the executioner nor the devil should have removed 'me.' On her trial she abused the Revolutionary Tribunal in set

terms, and poor Églé was sent to the guillotine as an incorrigible aristocrat, like many a better woman.

While these and a multitude of other similar scenes were passing around him, Beugnot himself had the good fortune not to be brought up for trial. The case against him was not very clear, and a letter written by him to Lafayette some months before, which would infallibly have cost him his head, escaped the notice of his enemies. Meanwhile his wife, who was in Paris and at liberty, was unremitting in her exertions. She came to see him in the disguise of the woman who washed his linen, and at last, at the most critical moment of his life, she succeeded in obtaining his removal to La Force, another prison reserved for persons less gravely compromised. Here he remained for some months longer, not without imminent peril; he was not liberated until after the fall of Robespierre on the 10th Thermidor.

At this point a gap occurs in the fragments that remain of M. Beugnot's Memoirs. We pass in a moment from the sanguinary gloom of the Reign of Terror in 1794, to the active and prosperous career of an Imperial Minister in 1808. After the 18th Brumaire and the accession of the First Consul, Beugnot was summoned by Lucien Bonaparte, who knew him, to serve under the Home Department. He filled a prefecture and was named a Counsellor of State—then an important post in the government; and upon the creation of the Kingdom of Westphalia he was selected to administer its finances. He remained, however, but a short time at Cassel, and was soon afterwards sent to Dusseldorf by Napoleon to organise and govern the Grand Duchy of Berg, which was eventually to be given to the son of the King of Holland. In the lottery of crowns which was drawn from month to month by the members and adherents of the Imperial family, it was difficult to foresee in what quarter of Europe a man might serve or reign. The Grand Duke of Berg of one year became King of Naples the next, and Beugnot, who was waiting at Bayonne to rejoin Murat, suddenly found himself on his way to the Lower Rhine. Ere he started he repaired to the Arch-Chancellor (Cambacérès) for his final instructions, which that distinguished gastronomer delivered in the following terms: 'My dear 'Beugnot, the Emperor settles the crowns as he pleases. All 'very well. The Grand Duke of Berg goes to Naples—so 'much the better. But his Highness was in the habit of sending 'me two dozen hams from his own duchy every year. The 'hams I must have. Take your measures accordingly.' The

hams were of course punctually sent as long as the stability of the French Empire allowed of it. They were not only to be sent, but sent gratis. Cambacérès had secured an arrangement with Lavalette, the Postmaster-General, by which every mail from different parts of the Empire brought a fresh tribute to the Arch-Chancellor's table, and the fact that he paid nothing for them appears to have given additional zest to these varied viands.

Talleyrand held a different language. He referred to what had just taken place at Bayonne in strong terms:—'Victories,' said he, 'cannot obliterate such actions as these, for they are 'base, fraudulent, and tricky. I can't tell you what the con-'sequence will be, but you will see that they will never be 'forgiven him.'

Dusseldorf was at that time the capital of a small state of about a million inhabitants, which had been formed of the principality recently ceded by the House of Bavaria, with some additions from the territory of German mediatised Princes, and the old ecclesiastical domains of Munster. Nothing could be more purely German, and the manner in which these provinces had been torn from their rightful sovereigns to form an appendage to the French Empire was perfectly characteristic of the age. Count Beugnot (for he had accepted that title) compares his own position to that of a Roman pro-consul.

'It was in those days a position in Europe to be a Frenchman, and a great position to represent the Emperor of the French. Except that I could not with impunity have abused my powers, I was in Germany what the pro-consuls of Rome had been of old. The same respect, the same obedience of the population, the same obsequiousness of the nobles, the same desire to win my favour and approval. We were still at that time under the spell of the peace of Tilsit. The invincibility of the Emperor was unshaken. I came from Paris, where I had spent my life at his Court, that is to say, amidst all the memorable deeds and marvels of his reign. In the Council I had seen that genius at work which ruled the human intelligence. I thought him born to be the true master of Fortune, and nothing appeared to me more natural than that the world should be at his feet. That seemed to me the future destiny of mankind. The country which fell to my lot augmented this illusion. Germany, ever prone to the marvellous, was long in losing her admiration of the Emperor. That admiration was still complete for the hero who had swept away the Prussian monarchy, the armies of Frederic, and the legions of the successors of Peter the Great.' (P. 313.)

These at least were M. Beugnot's own impressions; but we question whether the sentiments of Germany towards Napoleon in 1808 were not embittered by very different emotions. The

members of a ruling race are slow to understand, and dull to feel, that hidden hatred which lurks in the heart of a subject people. The French flattered themselves that they were governing Germany, until the war-cry of 1813 placed a musket in the hand of every child of that enduring but avenging people. We readily believe that M. Beugnot did what he could to render the domination of France endurable to the Germans. He was proud of his little duchy. He embellished and improved the city of Dusseldorf. Brought up to the law, he respected the rights of the population; and he had no tinge of that military spirit which was the sorest curse of Imperial France.

'I had an honest confidence in the importance and stability of my position; but my character preserved me from the excesses which might have excited the people against me. I love to seek out whatever is honourable and good, and from the bottom of my heart I respected the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy; but there, as at Cassel, I committed the fault of treating lightly what is serious to the Germans, of seeing everything with French eyes, and, more than all, of giving way to my taste for a joke. This last defect was that which was least forgiven, and I should have succeeded better if I had not given way to it.'

But he was compelled by the exigencies of the Cabinet of Paris, with which he corresponded, to drain the country of recruits for the armies of France and of supplies for their maintenance. On all occasions he was made to feel that the welfare of the province was subordinate to the interests of the Imperial Government, and that he formed but a fraction of the immense structure beneath which Napoleon had crushed the liberties of Europe. When that structure began to totter, the governor of the little out-work on the Rhine was one of the first to perceive the altered temper of the German nation, and the eagerness with which, after Essling, they watched every sign of its approaching dissolution. After the battles of Lutzen and Bautzen, and during the armistice of Prague, the Emperor himself passed a few days at Mayence and ordered Beugnot to join him there. The account of that interview is extremely graphic.

'I found the Emperor as firm and prompt as ever, but he was not at his ease in conversation, and he evidently thought he had a part to play. On the very first day he gave me a long account of his forces of all arms. Whenever he made an assertion in the course of his harangue, which might try my credulity, he watched me closely to observe the effect of his statements. Thus, when he said that the King of Denmark was giving him 40,000 horses, with which he should have the most formidable cavalry in Europe, I made, without intending it, I

must confess, a gesture of impatience, from which he inferred that I had no great reliance on his formidable cavalry. He grew angry. "You are one of those wiseacres," he broke out, "who are cocksure of everything. You say, after Frederic, that seven years are required to make a trooper. I tell you, that with good officers, regiments of cavalry are formed as soon as others. Put the men on horseback and they stick there. That is all the secret. Look at my guards of honour! Nothing can surpass them for courage and intelligence. They are admirable cavalry; have we been seven years forming them?" The conversation turned on the recent levies of Austria and Bavaria. I took the liberty of remarking that they were very strong, and I expressed some doubt of the political views of those Powers. The Emperor pooh-poohed my doubts, but without irritation. I inferred from the manner he spoke of it, that the same idea had more than once crossed his own mind. "I don't know," said he, "against whom these excessive levies of men are intended, by Austria especially. If this goes on, who is to stop? There will be none but women left in Europe to till the ground. I have an army as good as ever, and 400,000 strong. That is enough to right myself in the North. I shall not think of doubling it, though nothing would be more easy." I held my tongue, and acquiesced in everything his Majesty was pleased to wish me to believe. When he thought he had convinced me, he talked of the affairs of the Grand Duchy. He complained of the local troops, said they cost a great deal, and deserted the next morning. I replied that his Majesty could not expect a parcel of German clod-poles to fight like the *élite* of the French guards of honour. After some further discussion the Emperor gave up the second light regiment I was to furnish, and said he had rather impose on the country the re-organisation of a good Polish legion which would not desert. I replied that I hoped the expense would not exceed that of the regiment. To which the Emperor replied, "I must have the troops, and formed troops. Manage it as you like. The time for calculating so closely is past." The Emperor then dictated letters to me for two or three hours, and so many decrees that it would take the whole night to engross them. All this time he was walking up and down in his cabinet, dictating with great rapidity. He stopped a moment at the first word of the sentence, and then threw off the whole in a breath, which rendered it almost impossible to follow him.'

The art of the Emperor's secretaries consisted in seizing his meaning as well as they could, retaining if possible any characteristic expression, but putting the whole in their own words. He scarcely read the papers over when they were brought to him to sign, and only complained that they were written with too broad a margin. He insisted on not having any. After some little time Beugnot took an opportunity to urge the Emperor to grant to the inhabitants of the Duchy some relaxation of the state monopoly of tobacco, which had been imposed on them by France.

'When I had told my story, his Majesty replied, "It is inconceivable that you have not discovered the motive which makes me persist in maintaining the tobacco monopoly in the Duchy? It is not the affair of your Duchy, but of France. I know very well you gain nothing by it—perhaps you may lose; but what does that signify, if it is to the advantage of France? Know then that in every country in which the sale of tobacco is restricted by the State, and which borders on a country where the sale is free, you must reckon on a continental infiltration by smuggling for seven or eight leagues from the frontier. It is from that I want to protect France: you must prevent this infiltration as you can. I keep it at eight leagues from my frontiers. As matters now are, I can reckon on the returns of the left bank of the Rhine as much as on those of the interior of France. That is what I wanted. Guess then if I am going to sacrifice the interests of France to your convenience."'

Within the next few days the intelligence of the defection of Bavaria and the more than equivocal attitude of Austria reached the Imperial Court. Napoleon said no more of the 40,000 horses from Denmark and of his prodigious reinforcements. But one day when Beugnot through inadvertence took his master's chair in the imperial closet, and even took it more than once, Napoleon said to him, in a tone of expostulation rather than anger, 'You will sit in my place, I see; *you choose 'your time ill.*' Beugnot had the courage to persist in the representations he had already made in favour of the inhabitants of the Duchy, and he added that after all this was but a small concession to make, in order to give greater security to the rear of the French armies.

'"At such a time," I said, "the public opinion of a country should be taken into consideration." "I understand you," rejoined the Emperor, looking at me with animation, "you advise me to make concessions, and to show great respect for public opinion; those are the big phrases of the school to which you belong." "Sire, I am of no school but that of the Emperor." "That is a way of speaking, nothing more. You are of the school of the *idéologues*, like Regnault, like Rœderer, Louis, and Fontanes—no, not Fontanes, I am wrong, he belongs to another set of fools. Do you suppose I do not catch your meaning, through all the disguises in which you mask it? You are one of those who sigh for the liberty of the press, the liberty of the tribune, and who believe in the omnipotence of public opinion. Well then! I will tell you my last word!" Then putting his right hand on the hilt of his sword, he added, "As long as this sword hangs by my side, and may it long hang there, you shall have none of the liberties you are sighing for, not even that, Monsieur Beugnot, of making a fine speech of your own in the tribune." "But, sire, what enemy has traduced me to this extent in the eyes of the Emperor?" "No one; but I know you, and I know you better than you know yourself. You will bring those papers to me at the

cabinet this evening." I was dismissed, but I received the same evening an order to attend the following day at ten, and to remain at home where I could be found. My audience on the following day was postponed till four, and when I arrived at that hour, I was informed by the Chamberlain of the day that his Majesty was getting into his carriage to leave Mayence.' (Vol. ii. p. 19.)

Before many months had elapsed the sinister presentiments of M. Beugnot were fulfilled. Leipzig followed Dresden. The French troops in disorder retraced the great road of Germany which had so often led them to victory. The enemy pressed upon their rear, and very shortly nothing remained for the French Minister who was governing the Grand Duchy of Berg, but to pack up his papers, recross the Rhine, and leave his last dinner to be eaten by the Count de St. Priest, a French émigré who commanded the division of the Russian army which occupied Dusseldorf.

On the left bank of the Rhine the authority of France was still unshaken, and the Prefect of Aix-la-Chapelle would not believe that the allied armies could ever venture to cross that barrier. Six leagues from that city lay Marshal Macdonald at the head of what was called his army. Beugnot was ordered to go to his head-quarters and report on his troops. 'That,' said the Marshal, 'is soon done. The *personnel* of my army 'consists of myself, here present, and of the chief of my staff, 'General Gruneller: as to the *matériel*, that consists of four 'straw-chairs and a deal table. This is what they call at Paris 'the army of Marshal Macdonald.' On his return to Paris with this discouraging report, Beugnot had an audience of the Emperor, who still talked of preserving all that he possessed in Germany—his 100,000 men on the Elbe—and his determination to fall on the rear of the allies, and if they dared to cross the Rhine—'vous verriez une belle débâcle.' For the present, however, he ordered Beugnot to proceed to Lille in a position not sensibly differing from that of a Prefect. The order was insulting to a man of Beugnot's official rank, and he remonstrated accordingly. The Emperor replied in his usual style:—

'"What do you mean? Whosoever serves me must serve as it suits me, and where it suits me. Minister or not, I have not time to think about that, and if I send you anywhere as a *sous-préfet* your duty is to go." "No doubt, Sire, but a man who has filled a high office cannot go to a lesser office without an air of disgrace, for ——." "To the point, I am in a hurry. You must go to Lille, Duplantier is killing himself in my service there, which is no good to him or to me either. That department of the North is one of the gates of France, and you will have plenty to do there." "The

Emperor may rely on my zeal, but may I ask with what title I am to present myself in that department?" "Really, Monsieur Beugnot, you presume." "I beg the Emperor's pardon." "Is this a time for titles? Go there as Préfet, as Minister, as Emperor if you dare. How can you talk to me of such nonsense, when my head is on fire from morning till night? Your Macdonald does nothing, prevents nothing. Clouds of Cossacks are ravaging the Rhine departments. I have to organise the defence of the whole country, and with what? At such a moment I place one of the keys of France in your pocket, and you talk to me of titles! It is time enough to talk of that when you have nothing else to do. They told me you were a man of sense, but you don't show it. Start at the latest to-morrow morning. Correspond with my ministers, or write to me direct if there is any important reason. Good morning, Count Beugnot, a pleasant journey to you!"'

And that was Count Beugnot's last conversation with Napoleon Bonaparte. His mission to Lille was of course abortive. All he could do was to prepare the place against a siege by the Russian army, and while he was still at his post he received a note from his old friend Dupont de Nemours in the following terms:—

'Take care of yourself. The last barrier is broken down; the allies will enter Paris to-night or to-morrow.'

Nothing remained for the luckless Minister but to effect his escape in disguise. At Amiens he saw for the first time the white cockade. At Chantilly the people were cheering the Provisional Government and the House of Bourbon. At St. Denis the Cossacks were burning stacks and collecting forage. And that was the end of the First Empire.

The Emperor Napoleon had not altogether misjudged M. Beugnot, when he told him that he was one of the men who were sighing in their hearts for a more liberal form of Government. He had served the Empire, without approving its despotic policy, or abandoning the principles of the Legislative Assembly; and he readily lent himself to the establishment of a more liberal form of government, when the representatives of the nation first gathered round the throne of Louis XVI. M. de Talleyrand, the sinister genius of the Restoration, was his friend, and accordingly he transferred his allegiance without hesitation to the *entresol* of the Hôtel St. Florentin, which has witnessed so many of the most remarkable events of this century.*

* The small apartment of the Hôtel St. Florentin was the residence of Prince Talleyrand, and was afterwards occupied by Princess Lieven till her death. The Emperor Alexander of Russia lived, during his residence in Paris, on the first floor of the same hotel.

Talleyrand at once placed the Ministry of the Interior in his hands, and he was thus suddenly called upon to take a prominent and decided part in the restoration of Louis XVIII. to the throne.

The task was one of appalling difficulty. The air was infected by the exhalations of dead horses and dead bodies. The enormous supplies of food required for the Allied armies threatened to famish the people. The population was groaning under the horrors of invasion. The roads were blocked by troops or broken up by the recent military operations. Half France was in the hands of the enemy. The whole administrative machinery of the Empire was shattered to pieces. It deserves to be remembered to the immortal honour of Count Beugnot, that he was the man who, almost alone and unaided, faced these difficulties, and restored something like order in the kingdom. He entered the service of the Bourbons without prejudices or passion; he exercised the power confided to him without resentment; and it would have been well for the Court if they had had the wisdom to confide more implicitly in his patriotism and good sense. His evidence, therefore, on the true character of the First Restoration is of the highest value, and it absolutely contradicts the opinions which have too often been accredited in France.

'The enemies of the Bourbons have said and repeated, and they still repeat, that these Princes came back in 1814 in the baggage-waggons of the invader. So untrue is it that they came in that shameful guise, that the Duke of Wellington refused at Bordeaux to see the Duke of Angoulême, who had thrown himself into that town with more spirit than discretion; and when the magistrates of the town consulted the English General as to the conduct they should adopt towards this prince, the Duke of Wellington replied that he thought it would be unwise to commit themselves with the Duke of Angoulême whilst the allies were still negotiating at Chatillon with the ministers of Napoleon. At the same time *Monsieur* (the Comte d'Artois) was timidly approaching some of the towns of Lorraine, more careful to avoid the Austrian commander than the local authorities; he was far enough from invoking the forces of the invader, and he would have done so without success. He had taken refuge at Vesoul, where he was visited by a few gentlemen of the country, and avoided by the greater number. The Emperor of Russia declared in a proclamation of the 31st March, that the Allied Sovereigns would only recognise and guarantee a constitution given by the French nation to itself; and in reply to a deputation of the Senate on the 2nd April, the same Prince said, "It is just and wise to give to France strong and liberal institutions in harmony with the enlightened spirit of the age. The object of my allies and of myself is to protect the liberty of your decisions." It was only four days later, when

the Senate, by its Constitution, had recalled Louis Xavier of France to the throne, that the Bourbons were acknowledged. Till then, although France was occupied by 200,000 foreign troops, their existence was hazardous and obscure. And I am confident that if the Senate had at that moment summoned to the throne of France some other family than the Bourbons, that family would have been accepted by Europe, not only without difficulty, but with satisfaction, so generally was the prediction believed that the Bourbons would have great difficulty in maintaining themselves in the country.' (Vol. ii. p. 99.)

M. Beugnot had had, we think, no previous acquaintance with any members of the Royal Family, and he had no prepossessions in their favour. But the position he filled in the Provisional Government at the moment of the Restoration brought him into contact with the Comte d'Artois, and in spite of his own liberal views Beugnot had more personal regard for him than for Louis XVIII. The constant opposition which really existed between these two royal brothers originated in their characters, but it was strengthened by the whole course of their lives. It had divided the emigration at Coblenz; it divided the friends of the Restoration at Paris; and in spite of the superior abilities, tact, and judgment of the King, the most influential member of the Royalist party was his brother.

On the 12th of April the Comte d'Artois made his triumphal entry into Paris. That was beyond a doubt the brightest day of the Restoration. The enthusiasm of the people was genuine. The crowds flocking around him arrested his passage from the Barrière de Bondy to Notre Dame. To some one, who attempted to make way for him, the Prince exclaimed, 'Laissez, 'Monsieur, laissez, j'arriverai toujours trop tôt.' On his return to the Tuileries, Beugnot expressed a hope that he was not 'fatigued.' 'Fatigued? How should I be fatigued? This is the 'only day of happiness I have had for thirty years . . .' But, after all, the brilliant impressions of the day were over, and the mighty work was not complete. 'There remains,' said M. de Talleyrand, 'the article to be written for the "Moniteur;" and, 'above all, what had the Prince himself said on so memorable 'an occasion?' Nobody could recollect. The probability is that beyond a few incoherent expressions of pleasure and of gratitude, he had said nothing at all. Then it was that Beugnot reached the culminating instant of his life. He tried it once. He tried it twice. M. de Talleyrand was not satisfied. At last M. Pasquier gave a fortunate hint, and at the third effort, Beugnot produced (out of his inner consciousness) those memorable words which appeared in the 'Moniteur' the

next morning, and have been ascribed to the Prince by an admiring posterity: 'Plus de divisions: la paix et la France: 'je la revois enfin! et rien n'y est changé, si ce n'est qu'il 's'y trouve nos Français de plus!' 'Capital,' said the great Censor, 'and I give you my word that the Prince will be- 'lieve in a day or two that he really uttered them, and 'nobody will recollect you had a hand in the matter.' The *bon mot* has outlived not only the Prince, but the dynasty; and as M. Beugnot lost the honour of it in his lifetime, it is but fair that it should now be restored to his memory.

The following anecdote of that pedantic priest, the Abbé de Pradt, Archbishop of Malines under the Empire, is so droll that we must make room for it:—

'The day the Provisional Government was formed, the Archbishop of Malines called on M. de Talleyrand, and expressed his surprise that so important a structure should have been raised without reserving a place for him in it, and he asked the Prince with some illhumour what it was intended to do for him, as he clearly could not be left out. "Leave you out," exclaimed the Prince, "far from it. You can at this moment render a most signal service. Have you got a white pocket-handkerchief?"—"Yes."—"But a very white one!"—"Certainly."—"Let me see it then." The Archbishop pulls out his handkerchief, Talleyrand takes it by one corner, and waves it frantically in the air, shouting, "Vive le Roi." "You see what I am doing—now take your handkerchief, do as I do—go down along the Boulevard towards the Faubourg St. Antoine, waving the white standard crying "Vive le Roi."—"But, Prince, you can't mean it. Just look at my dress. I am in my bishop's wig—my cross, my legion of honour."—"Just so," rejoined Talleyrand, "that is just what is wanted. If you had not got them on, you would have had to fetch them. Cross, wig, powder, dress, all that will make a sensation, and it is a sensation we want."

'It is hardly credible that M. de Pradt, a man not without talent and ability, should have fallen into such a trap. But off he went on Talleyrand's errand. At first he got on pretty well, though he was soon surrounded by a crowd of street blackguards, but when he reached the Boulevard Poissonière, the Archbishop fell upon a knot of Bonapartists, who soon charged him and sent him flying homewards. His flight was so rapid that he had to pocket the white standard and to rush through the mud. In this state he got back to the Rue St. Florentin, where he proceeded to relate with great emphasis his daring and his success. He had conquered a great part of the capital to the royal cause; he had been stopped at the Faubourg Poissonière by obstacles which could only have yielded to a troop of horse; but he still showed in his retreat that he was alike unmoved by the eye of Bonaparte and by the tumult of the populace, *prava jubentium*. All which M. de Talleyrand listened to with the utmost coolness, and only said, "I told you that dressed as you are, you would make a sensation."' (Vol. ii. p. 105.)

The sketches of the Comte d'Artois and the new-born royalist Court are extremely fresh and diverting, but we must leave them on one side to preserve a more sober portrait of the King, who shortly afterwards reached his capital. The entry of Louis XVIII. into Paris was less animated than that of his brother. The performance suffered by repetition, and the enthusiasm of the people had begun to evaporate. Above all, the chief actor was not the same. The Comte d'Artois was still the 'gay cavalier' of Versailles, graceful, excitable, and French in every gesture. Louis XVIII. was corpulent, infirm, and dignified. When it was proposed to put him on horseback, he contented himself with the remark, 'I tremble 'for the marshals who would have to support me.' And the sallies he frequently indulged in were more calculated to sting than to soothe those about him.

'Louis XVIII. maintained all the dignity of the throne amidst that mob of sovereigns who were then assembled in Paris, escorted by thousands of soldiers. Though he was himself unarmed and well nigh powerless, he was so full of the superiority of the King of France over all other kings, that even they were persuaded of it. The Emperor of Russia himself accepted it. M. de Talleyrand had failed in an attempt to cause the Duke de Vicence, who was his friend, to be included in the peerage; but as the Emperor Alexander professed a particular regard for this personage, he undertook to ask Louis XVIII. for his advancement. His Imperial Majesty repaired to the Tuileries. The King received him most graciously, but without the least relaxation of his own dignity. Alexander was so taken aback, that he did not venture to ask for a thing likely to be refused him; he came back as he went, and candidly acknowledged the reason to M. de Talleyrand. Talleyrand told the Emperor that he was the only man in Paris who did not know his own power, and begged he would try again. This time the King had heard of the affair and was on his guard. The Emperor had not a chance. Louis XVIII. began by flattering generalities which melted Alexander, and he then touched on the melancholy position of a sovereign, after a revolution, who was not free either to grant or to refuse his favours. All this was said with such a tone of feeling and truth, that the Emperor was again taken in, and left the palace without alluding to the object of his visit. He thought it easier to offer Caulaincourt a great position in Russia, than to mention his name to the King of France. In such passages as these the King was really a great master; and I had more than one opportunity of remarking that he was himself thoroughly persuaded that of all the sovereigns then in Paris, he was the only gentleman.' (Vol. ii. p. 137.)

Not a year had elapsed since M. Beugnot was writing despatches under the dictation of Napoleon at Mayence. It now

became his duty to attend Louis XVIII. as Minister of the Interior, and to take his commands on the urgent questions of the day. A greater contrast has rarely fallen under the observation of a statesman.

'I arrived on the 6th May to work with the King. I brought him some important affairs, which *Monsieur* had not chosen to decide, having heard of his brother's speedy arrival. I had recently had occasion to lay matters of state before Napoleon, and I adopted with the King the same form of proceeding—that is to say, I had all the papers of each case carefully arranged, and I placed a précis before his Majesty stating the name of the parties, the nature of the question, its importance, and some observations upon it. I begged the King to look over the précis and tell me which paper he desired to take first. His Majesty, who had never seen or dreamt of anything of the kind, asked me what I meant.

'I had the *maladresse* to say that this was the way in which Napoleon transacted business, as he was very much pressed for time, and therefore chose the questions which appeared to be the most important. "Very well, sir," said the King, "but as I shall always have as much time to give you as you may require, you may relinquish these modes of proceeding of Bonaparte. They are not to my taste. Begin at the beginning."'

After this exordium Beugnot had the barbarity to keep his unfortunate master an hour and a half over the papers. 'You 'have not spared me,' said the restored son of St. Louis. 'This 'is pretty well for a beginning. However, I shall always be 'ready to receive you.' And the next day he inquired whether his minister had not been a lawyer, from his love of detail. At length the Abbé Louis came to the rescue.

'How came you not to see, on the very first day, my dear colleague, that you bore the King to death? What is the use of making reports to him? You might as well make them to a saint in his niche. I just give him the ordinance to sign; he never refuses; while he is writing his name, which he does very slowly, I tell him what it is about. I don't bore him; but he bores me, because his signature is everlasting.'

It is not surprising that a minister taught under so different a school, and so little versed in the temper of the old Court, should soon be told to vacate his office. Beugnot only saw the King six times. Madame de Simiane and the Damas family remarked that the Ministry of the Interior ought to be filled by a man of quality, assisted by what she elegantly termed '*des bouleux*,' and the Abbé de Montesquiou was authorised to request M. Beugnot to retire from the department. He consented, however, somewhat weakly we think, to act as Director-General of the Police, and he was named by the King

one of the Royal Commissioners charged with the preparation of the Charter.

The chapters of the second volume of these memoirs which record at considerable length the discussions on this important instrument are, for the purposes of history, the most valuable portion of M. Beugnot's reminiscences. But they are already known to the public and, in particular, they have been largely used by M. Duvergier de Hauranne, in the second volume of his admirable 'History of Parliamentary Government in 'France.' It would draw us too far from our present object to follow M. Beugnot in this portion of his life—suffice it to observe that the notes of these debates were evidently made at the time, and that they are the most authentic record which exists of the origin of the Charter of 1814.

We prefer to revert to his personal recollections and adventures during the Hundred Days.

A very short experience of the character of the Prince who was thus, by the grace of God, replaced on the throne of France, might have satisfied a man of the world like M. Beugnot, that nothing was to be expected from such a master. But it was a time of illusions, and probably the ambition of playing a more brilliant part under the Constitutional Monarchy than he had done under the Empire, induced M. Beugnot to take too flattering a view of the future and of his own prospects. Upon the return of Napoleon in March 1815, he accompanied the King to Ghent; he shared the privations and anxieties of the Hundred Days in Flanders, when the royalists and the Court were once more reduced to an ordinary of half-a-crown a day, and he returned to Paris after Waterloo. Perhaps the disappointment he afterwards felt at the King's faithlessness and ingratitude may have rendered him severe to Louis XVIII., but M. Beugnot is the only writer of the time, as far as we remember, who places Charles X. in ability above his brother.

'Those who have never had occasion to transact business with *Monsieur* are always talking of his want of capacity, his narrow views, and his obstinacy. These reproaches are utterly unfounded. *Monsieur* applies to business a great deal of intelligence and earnest attention. It must be admitted that he sticks to the principles in which he was brought up; but his attachment to them is based on conviction, not on prejudice, as may easily be perceived from the skill with which he defends them. He is not without dexterity in argument, and readily seizes on any advantageous point of discussion. All this is, moreover, covered with absolute good faith, and no man has a conscience more void of offence.' (Vol. ii. p. 238.)

Few people have said as much for Charles X., and M.

Beugnot is evidently speaking the language of personal regard. For Charles X. did undoubtedly inspire the strongest personal regard to those who knew him, whether on the throne or in exile. Louis XVIII., on the contrary, can hardly be said to have had a sincere friend or to have deserved one; for though his attainments, his wit, and his judgment were far beyond those of his brother, his character was one of unmitigated selfishness and extreme duplicity.

After the battle of Waterloo the King lost no time in re-entering his own dominions. He ordered his Ministers to meet him at Cambrai, where a *Te Deum* was sung in honour of the victory of the Allied armies, and the Court travelled with so much rapidity that they had reached the gates of Paris before it was known that they had left Ghent. Fouché alone was in the secret of the King's movements, for that ingenious personage, foreseeing the speedy termination of the Hundred Days, had continued to negotiate with Ghent, while he was still ostensibly serving the Emperor at the Tuileries, and he took care to warn the King that the least delay in his return might be fatal to the dynasty. On the road to Paris Count Beugnot and Count de Jaucourt followed the King in another carriage. As they proceeded on their way, marks of the passage of the invading armies became more frequent, and near the village of Cavilly they passed the cottage of a widow which had been set on fire by some marauders. The poor woman sat on a stone disconsolate to watch the destruction of her little all; her children were sobbing on her knees, and the whole scene was most afflicting. It seemed strange that the King of France in his coach should have passed along the road a few minutes before without taking the slightest notice of such an incident. However his two followers relieved the poor woman and kept their suspicions to themselves, charitably supposing that the King might have been asleep. Arrived at the village where the King was to dine, they rejoined his Majesty, and the following conversation ensued.

'"We are happy to see that the King is arrived in safety, but your Majesty cannot fail to have been painfully affected by what we have just witnessed—a house on fire; it belonged to a poor widow with her two wretched children, and not a soul to help her."

'"Ah, indeed!" said the Monarch; "I saw the house burning, and remarked that there was no one to put it out."

'*M. de Jaucourt.* "It had been set on fire by some of the enemy's light troops, and the people of the village fled at their approach."

'*The King.* "Something of that kind, I suppose."

'*M. de Jaucourt.* "They must have pillaged the country, for

we were told just now that there would be a difficulty in providing the King's dinner."

'*The King.* "Oh! don't be uneasy. You are not aware, M. de Jaucourt, that the rabbits of this village are the most juicy rabbits in France—in all France. I remember coming here thirty years ago; nay, four-and-thirty years, it must have been, with the Marquis de Montesquiou and Chabrillant. The people of the country have a peculiar mode of dressing rabbits. I am to have two of them for dinner, and shall not be ill off . . ."

'We were far enough from the poor widow and her house on fire, but M. de Jaucourt artfully brought it up again.

'"The King is good enough to conceal his own privations, but it is the duty of his servants to share them, for the occurrence I was just speaking of—that fire in the widow's house—is one which will happen elsewhere, and we must all do as much as we are able, for it cannot everywhere be said that a disaster witnessed by the King is a disaster repaired."

'*The King.* "What can be done, gentlemen? It is not my fault. We must do as we did last year. Time and patience will set things to rights. I can't ask my Ministers to dine with me to-day; but I strongly recommend you to take care to taste those rabbits . . ." and the gesture of dismissal.' (Vol. ii. p. 284.)

If Talleyrand was the genius of the first Restoration, Fouché was that of the second. It was impossible to avoid a recognition of his services—perhaps we might say the stipulated reward of them; and as M. Beugnot had performed the office of Secretary of State on the journey, it devolved on him to present to Louis XVIII.,—for signature at St. Denis, the ordinance conferring the office of Minister of Police on the regicide Fouché, now Duke of Otranto. The King signed one or two other papers, and made a joke about the opera.

'At that moment I laid before him the nomination of the Duke of Otranto. The King glanced at it and dropped it. His pen fell from his hands. The blood rushed to his face. His eyes assumed a painful expression. For some minutes the silence was unbroken. At last with a deep sigh the King said, "It must be done, then." He took up the pen, still hesitating to sign, and added as he wrote, "Ah! my poor brother! if you see what I am doing I am already forgiven." His tears fell from his eyes upon the paper. I folded up the ordinance and left the room without another word.' (Vol. ii. p. 290.)

After the fidelity he had shown and the services he had rendered in the second exile, M. Beugnot had reason to rely on the assurances he had received of his Sovereign's gratitude and regard. He was not, however, included in the Ministerial arrangements, and the Ministry of Marine, which had been designed for him, was handed over to his travelling companion,

M. de Jaucourt. On this occasion the King offered him the Post Office, with the rank of Minister, adding, 'This position 'will suit you, for it rescues you from Ministerial changes, 'and you will keep it as long as you retain my personal con- 'fidence,—that is, a long while or rather always.' Not long afterwards M. de Vitrolles reminded his Majesty that the Post Office had been promised to himself, and expressed his regret that Beugnot had not been named to higher functions. 'Have 'patience,' replied the supple Prince, 'you shall have the Post 'Office, when I take it away from Beugnot, and that will not 'be long . . .' We have not patience to track the maze of intermediate intrigue, with which the Court was already undermined. It is enough to add that before many weeks had elapsed, and on the first change of Ministry, the King took occasion to inform Count Beugnot with evident embarrassment at his next audience, that another person had just been appointed to the office he filled!

At this point the memoirs abruptly terminate, and we presume that this was Count Beugnot's last experiment in the service of his Majesty King Louis XVIII. Nor, indeed, did he again hold office; he sat in the Chamber of Deputies from 1819 to 1824, voting generally with the Liberal party; in 1830 he was raised to the Peerage, and in 1833 he reached the close of his honourable and eventful life.

ART. II.—1. *Historical and Statistical Information respecting the History, Condition, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States.* Collected and prepared under the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, by HENRY ROWE SCHOOLCRAFT (COLCRAFT). Illustrated by S. EASTMAN, Capt. U. S. Navy. 6 vols. 4to. Philadelphia: 1851—1860.

2. *Antiquities of the State of New York: with a Supplement on the Antiquities of the West (reprinted from the Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge).* By EPHRAIM GEORGE SQUIER. 8vo. Buffalo: 1851.

3. *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan, with an Introduction.* By FREDERICK CATHERWOOD. Fol. London: 1844.

4. *Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America. Illustrated.* By The Abbé EMANUEL DOMENECH. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1860.

5. *Anahuac; or Mexico and the Mexicans, Ancient and Modern.* With a Map and Illustrations. By EDWARD B. TYLOR. 8vo. London: 1861.

THE northern continent of America affords, though it might seem otherwise, an extensive field for archæological research and an excellent test of the true value of the theories which have been propounded as to the origin of civilisation and of art in the eastern hemisphere. Historically as well as geographically, the area is almost unbounded, and has been occupied, in all probability, from the remotest antiquity, by different nations, if not by different races of mankind, in various stages of social, political, and intellectual development. The ancient remains, many of which are in a singularly perfect condition, considering the lapse of so many centuries, are calculated to impress the most stolid beholder with admiration and awe. Unlike the relics of antiquity in the Old World, they have suffered less from the vandalism of man than from the ravages of time. The advancing immigrant and the retreating Indian—each in his turn—have contributed to their preservation; the one from economical, the other from superstitious motives. Their number is so vast, their distribution so unequal, and their character so diverse as to render any attempt at a classification—in this place at least—a profitless task. From Guatemala to Upper Canada, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, the surface is strewn

with stupendous ruins of pyramidal temples and tumuli, entrenched camps and fortifications, walled towns and villages, amphitheatres and pictorial grottos, embankments and bridges, towers and obelisks, wells and aqueducts, high roads and causeways, gardens and artificial meadows; the greater part of which were designed, constructed, and maintained by numerous, intelligent, and skilful races of men who have long since disappeared from the several scenes of their labour, bequeathing to posterity no written, nor even a solitary traditional memorial of themselves or of their ancestors. Some portion of their history, nevertheless, may be dimly discerned by the light of analogy. But before speculating on their probable origin, or determining to what particular branch of the human family they belonged, or from whom they derived elementary instruction in the arts and conveniences of life, let us take a glance at their country, as it presented itself to the astonished gaze of the Spaniards at the commencement of the sixteenth century.

In that age, the continent of North America, so far as relates to its territorial divisions, its political circumstances, and the dispersion of its multitudinous families, differed less than might be supposed from its present condition. Then, as now, fixed communities and nomadic tribes divided the soil between them. In their respective modes of existence, the best of the inhabitants exhibited but an imperfect civilisation, and the worst of them but a qualified barbarism; the first were emerging from, and the second were sinking into, a state of social decrepitude and moral ruin. Nor is this the only instance of the verification in the New World of the maxim in the Old, that history reproduces itself. As in the nineteenth so in the sixteenth century, one great national confederation eclipsed all the surrounding principalities or kingdoms. The ancient Mexican League, including the several sovereignties of Anahuac, Tezcuco, and Tlacopan, occupied that preeminent position, and exercised that paramount influence, north of the Tropic of Cancer, which has since become the indisputable inheritance of the United States. Less intelligent and humane than the Acolhuans and Nahuatlacas, the founders respectively of Tezcuco and Tlacopan, but more warlike and ambitious than either, the Aztecas of Mexico assumed the lead in all military and aggressive enterprises, and were gradually extending their dominion, which already reached from the 14th to the 21st degree of north latitude, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, when they were startled by the sudden apparition of the Spaniards. The story of their tragical

conquest, as has been remarked, reads more like a fiction of romance than a chapter in the annals of mankind. But with that story, excepting so far as concerns the progress which the unfortunate Aztecas had made in civilisation and the arts, we have little to do in this place. Their conquerors in penetrating Central America, and reaching the elevated regions of Anahuac, were not less astonished by the multitude of stately and populous cities than by the wealth and magnificence of the tropical landscape. Both were a surprise and surpassingly beautiful to the hardy invaders. 'When I beheld the delicious 'scenery around me,' exclaims that honest old soldier, Bernal Diaz, 'I thought we had been transported by magic to the 'terrestrial paradise . . . Some of our men, who had visited 'both Rome and Constantinople, declared that they had not 'seen anything comparable in those cities for convenient and 'regular distribution, or for numbers of people.' Works of public utility, some built of brick and some of stone, were visible in every direction, many of which in magnitude as well as in grandeur rivalled the most celebrated structures of antiquity in the Old World. The terraced-pyramid of Cholula, in the sacred province of Puebla, which was crowned with an elaborately decorated *teocalli*, or 'house of God,' and which was built, it has been supposed, upon the model of the Temple of Belus, described by Herodotus, covered an area double that of the largest of the Egyptian pyramids; but its altitude was greatly disproportioned to the vast extent of its base, being no more than 177 feet, or a third only of that of Cheops. The interior walls of the teocalli were adorned with curiously wrought plates of silver and gold, profusely studded with gems. A much greater expenditure of wealth and ingenuity was bestowed upon the shrine of the tutelary god, whose statue, larger than life, was graved in the most durable stone, and painted in the most gorgeous colours. There was not a city or populous village within the confines of the Anahuacan territory, or in the provinces to the south of it, which could not boast of a temple more or less conspicuous for its magnitude and sumptuous embellishments. In fact, storied palaces of princes and nobles, each elevated on a series of artificial platforms, with magnificent flights of steps reaching to the summit; long ranges of scarcely inferior terraced buildings, with pillared façades fantastically carved, which were exclusively set apart for the Mexican priesthood; and gigantic lithic monuments, bearing the mystical emblems of Sabean, Phallic, and Ophite worship, met the gaze of the Spanish soldier whithersoever he turned himself.

But architecture was not the only art practised by the ancient Mexican. He was equally skilled in metallurgy. Gold, silver, copper, lead, and tin were the five metals that his country produced, or that were known to him; and in manipulating these he was confessedly not inferior to the expertest craftsman in Europe. His tools for hewing the toughest timber, as well as for dressing the hardest rock, were made of copper alloyed with a small proportion of tin. He found in that composite metal an efficient substitute for iron and steel. His sculptured images, cut out of solid blocks of basalt, are marvellous specimens of manual skill. Swords, knives, and other implements, requiring the keenest edge, were made of obsidian, a most difficult and intractable material of volcanic origin, which he split into the desired form with amazing dexterity. Long after the subjugation of his country by the Spaniards, he set little store by that metal the possession of which so many of our modern archæologists persist in making the sole criterion of a civilised condition. His skill and industry as a mechanic may be judged from a remarkable passage in Mr. Tylor's 'Anahuac':—

'In the ploughed fields, in the neighbourhood [of Tezcuco], we made (says that gentleman) repeated trials whether it was possible to stand still in any spot where there was no relic of Old Mexico within our reach; but this we could not do. Everywhere the ground was full of unglazed pottery and obsidian, and we even found arrows and clay figures that were good enough for a museum.' (P. 147.)

The Aztecas were likewise indefatigable tillers of the ground; and the East—and through the East the whole world—is indebted to them for the successful cultivation of the maize and cotton plants. Their famous floating *parterres*, on the great lake of Tezcuco, bore witness to their singular taste and ingenuity as floriculturists and gardeners. Like the Egyptians, they had contrived a pictorial method of recording events, and so of perpetuating amongst themselves, if not for the advantage of alien posterities, the chief particulars of their history. It cannot be said with certainty, but the fact is far from improbable, that they had invented a phonographical as well as a hieroglyphical character. They had even made some advancement in the physical sciences, especially in astronomy; and had a solar year with intercalations more accurately calculated than that of the Greeks and Romans. But neither the greatest progress in the mechanical arts and physical sciences, nor the possession of the most ingenious and equitable code of laws, and its due administration, will compensate for

the absence of a humanising, if not spiritualising, system of religion. The bloody ritual of the Aztecan priesthood constitutes by far the foulest page in the humiliating register of superstition and fanaticism. The rites of Moloch and Astaroth appear merciful when contrasted with those of Mexitli and Teoyaomiqni, whose abominable altars, from sunrise to sunset, reeked with the fumes of human gore. The victims were usually captives taken on the battle-field. The effects of national depravity, unhappily, are not to be restricted to the limits of the country within which it originates; on the contrary, like circles made by the falling of a stone on a pool of water, they continue to expand with irresistible momentum until the area—be it small or be it large, an island or a continent—is completely overspread. Thus, to this day, the baneful effects of former cruelty in Mexico are still widely felt on the northern continent of America. The untutored descendants of those people whom the Aztecas so relentlessly pursued—we allude to the unsettled and degenerate Indians wandering over the vast deserts to the west of the Mississippi—still retaliate upon their neighbours the shocking barbarities which their ancestors endured; and were any additional evidence required in support of the true origin of the lingering practice, it is conveyed in the fact that they likewise excuse themselves with the plea of a duty no less sacred than urgent. The Old World adage, 'we live more by example than by reason,' expresses in brief the moral status of every savage community.

The national records of the Aztecas, confirmed in a great measure by the observations of their conquerors, establish several most interesting and important facts in the natural history of civilisation. When first confronted by the Spaniards they had been seated in Mexico rather less than one hundred and fifty years. Towards the close of the twelfth century of our era, they had migrated from a spot traditionally known as Atzlan, or 'the country of water;' most likely the territory inclosed within the angle formed by the junction of the Rio Colorado and the Rio Gila, at the head of the Gulf of California. They did not reach the table-land of Anahuac, however, until the year 1324. No date in their history has been better established than this. We have an indubitable instance, therefore, of a nomadic horde suddenly suppressing the instincts of their nature, relinquishing the habits of savage life, becoming a permanently settled people, developing a capacity for political organisation, raising stupendous piles of brick and stone, constructing and embellishing innumerable cities, cultivating the arts and sciences, and making such

advancement in astronomy more particularly, as not only to rival but to surpass that which was made by the most enlightened nations of antiquity in Asia and Europe. And all these astonishing results are crowded within the comparatively limited space of a century and a half! We are left in no doubt, moreover, whence this extraordinary people, and the tribes associated with them, derived much of their civilisation, and a knowledge at least of architecture — facts which are quite as remarkable as those just mentioned. The Mexican empire was built upon the ruins of that of the Toltecas, who, in the eleventh century, had been overwhelmed by the successive calamities of war, famine, and pestilence. Like the Aztecas, the Toltecas had travelled originally from the north-western parts of the continent; and, according to the local historians contemporary with the first Spanish adventurers, had occupied the vale of Anahuac from the seventh century of our era. They are said to have been established in New Mexico from 300 B.C., which, we may observe by the way, is the earliest assumed date in the annals of the aboriginal Americans. The origin of the Toltecas is shrouded in mythological fable. It was traditionally held that their ancestors had migrated from 'the distant east, beyond immense seas 'and lands.' They had wrested the territory of Anahuac from a powerful nation called the Ulmecas, or Olmecas, who, in their turn, had displaced the Quinámes, a fabulous race of giants. The light of documentary history just reflects the declining years of the Toltecan dominion, and discloses to our view the preeminent position which they held in the eyes of their contemporaries, and the favourable influence that they exercised over them. Of all the ancient American nations of whom tradition or history has preserved any notice, these people were by far the most civilised and ingenious. Humboldt has designated them the Pelasgi of the western hemisphere, and Prescott states that their tribal appellation is synonymous with architect. The survivors of their race, when driven from their old habitations, retreated towards the Isthmus of Panama, and scattered themselves about Yucatan, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, where their presence may be traced to this day in the language of the people and in the numberless ruins of once beautiful structures.

Spanish intolerance in the New World, at the period of the conquest, which involved the loss of so many precious memorials of a primitive people, and Spanish jealousy in subsequent times, which denied the foreigner access to, and almost a glimpse of, the vanquished territories, will abundantly account

for the ignorance of Europeans in general, and of such authors as Robertson in particular, as to the real condition of America in the pre-Columbian ages. For his well-known history, that admirable writer was exclusively dependent upon Spanish authorities; whose national, to say nothing of their ecclesiastical prejudices (nine-tenths of them were churchmen), would necessarily make them reluctant if not treacherous guides. Hence he was led to believe that, excepting within the limits of the two great monarchies of Mexico and Peru, the whole continent of America had been, from the earliest epoch, the abode of uncivilised men. 'There is not' (says he*) 'in all 'the extent of the vast empire a single monument, or vestige 'of any building, more ancient than the conquest;' and again: 'The inhabitants of the New World were in a state of society 'so extremely rude as to be unacquainted with those arts 'which are the first essays of human ingenuity in its advance 'towards improvement.' When the historian thus expressed himself he was totally ignorant not only of the existence of those remarkable edifices in Central America which have been recently exhumed from the depths of tropical vegetation—all incontestably proving that the builders of them, instead of being, as he too hastily concluded, a savage and uncultivated people, had made, on the contrary, very considerable progress in civilisation and in the higher branches of art—but also of those much more ancient monuments, which, according to local report, 'may be counted by thousands and by tens of thou-'sands,' and which are to be found, for the most part, on the alluvions of the Mississippi and Missouri, and, to a lesser extent, in the States of the Union bordering on the Gulf of Mexico. In those States, more especially, he who runs may read one of the earliest chapters in the history of his species after the Dispersion; or find, if he will, the very counterpart of—

> 'The fallen towers
> Of Babylon, the eternal pyramids,
> Memphis and Thebes, and whatsoe'er of strange
> Sculptur'd on alabaster obelisk,
> Or jasper tomb, or mutilated sphinx,
> Dark Ethiopia on her desert hills
> Conceals.'

For the western hemisphere can boast of an Egypt as well as the eastern.

The aboriginal monuments of North America, including

* Hist. of Amer. b. iv.

those of Mexico and of the provinces to the south of it, are clearly referable to three distinct and, possibly, very widely-separated epochs in the pre-Columbian history of the continent. For conveniency's sake we shall designate these epochs respectively the Earliest, the Intermediate, and the Recent; and agreeably with what has gone before, we shall invert the order of this sequence. By this arrangement we shall hope to establish the general fact of mankind in the New World—whatever may have been their destiny in the Old—never having extinguished that spark of divinity which was originally kindled within them; or, in other words, wholly lost that civilisation which they had inherited from their progenitors, the first wanderers from the northern regions of India, that 'real primordial land' (as Schlegel emphatically calls it), where everything combines to point out a common origin of our faith, our knowledge, and our history. By 'civilisation' we simply mean, in this place, the converse of barbarism. There have been throughout all time divers phases of civilisation, as well as divers populations in the world – an agrestic as well as an urban civilisation; and the progress achieved, in either case, has depended as much upon local resources as upon the idiosyncrasy of the people. To what degree of civilisation the North American nations in pre-historical times had attained, can only be judged analogically, or by comparing their structural monuments and relics of art with those of the most cultivated people of antiquity in the Old World. In the new edition of Mr. Fergusson's History of Architecture, which is a monument of erudition, taste, and ingenious reasoning, the author has devoted a chapter to the architectural remains of the early American peoples, and has shown that whatever can now be known of those extinct and unrecorded races must be derived from a searching comparison of the structures they left behind them. There, and there alone, are still to be found the vestiges of their passage on the earth; and it is from these mute witnesses that we have chiefly extracted the evidence we are about to lay before our readers.

At the period of the conquest by Cortez, the valley of Anahuac, although recognised as the chief seat of political authority on the northern continent of America, was not the centre of civilisation. The people of the southern provinces, from Yucatan and Panama, were much more refined and ingenious than their unscrupulous suzerains, the Aztecas, with whom the keen-sighted Spanish conqueror, when he was ennobled by his sovereign, and permitted to select a territory for himself, cast in his lot. Their magnificent architectural

remains have been made known to Europe by the able pens of Messrs. Stephens and Norman and the pencils of Messrs. de Waldeck and Catherwood. The first and last-named gentlemen, in their irregular wanderings together about Central America, discovered no less than fifty-four ancient cities, and incidentally heard of many others, situated in deserts and forests, which they were unable to explore. The most interesting monuments of this extinct civilisation were found at Uxmal or Itzlan, Palenqué, Ocosingo, Oajaca, Santa Cruz del Quiché, and Copan. The wildest opinions have been expressed as to the supposed antiquity of these remains, the principal of which consist of temples, palaces, and other imposing structures, usually elevated upon pyramidal mounds, or upon vast terraces of stone or of sun-dried brick, now all in various stages of decay. M. de Waldeck supposes the ruins of Palenqué, in Chiapas, to be not less than 3,000 years old; and some antiquaries have even relegated them to an antediluvian epoch! Other travellers who have also visited them lend no countenance whatever to such extravagant conclusions as these. As Mr. Fergusson long ago observed, in a climate so fatal as that of Central America to the durability of any class of buildings, it is obvious that those still in existence cannot belong to a very remote era. The presence of timber in most of them is conclusive on this point.*

The period within which we are disposed to limit the building of the Central American edifices ranges from the first to the seventh century of our era. The interior arrangement and decorations of some of the temples appear to indicate an Asiatic source, and afford, therefore, a clue to an approximate date of their erection. In the order of time, the ruins of Copan, in the province of Honduras, abounding with monolithic statues of Indian deities, are probably amongst the oldest of the series; those of Santa Cruz del Quiché, in Guatemala, which are in the most dilapidated condition of any, rank next to them; then follow those of Uxmal, in Yucatan, where neither an idol nor carved tablet is to be seen; whilst those of Mitlan in Oajaca, and of Palenqué in Chiapas, the former conspicuous for their Cyclopean masonry, and the latter for their elaborate ornamentation, are amongst the most modern of the series. Want of space precludes our entering upon any particular description of these and similar interesting vestiges of antiquity which are so lavishly scattered over the

* *Vide* Stephens and Catherwood's Incidents of Travel, p. 523: edit. 1854.

entire surfaces of Yucatan and Central America. We can do little more in this place than refer our readers to the admirable delineations of the most perfect of them by Mr. Catherwood, which that gentleman published in this country a few years ago; and to the sumptuous work of M. de Waldeck, which is still in progress. The several structures differ, of course, in various minor details, but the striking affinities observable in all of them betoken a common origin. 'It is curious,' says Mr. Fergusson, although he is no implicit believer in the transmission of races, 'that as we advance eastward from 'the Valley of the Euphrates, at every step we meet with forms 'of art more and more like those of Central America.'* Von Humboldt was the first, we believe, to remark the curious points of resemblance between many of the architectural remains in the New World and the most ancient of those in the Old; but he was much too cautious a *savant* to commit himself to any positive theory in the matter in the absence of better illustrations than Mexico alone afforded him. Had he been permitted, however, to penetrate the interior of Central America, and to gaze upon

> '—— the ruin'd temples there;
> Stupendous columns, and wild images
> Of more than man; where marble demons watch
> The Zodiac's brazen mystery, and dead men
> Hang their mute thoughts on the mute walls around,'

his shrewd suspicions regarding their true origin would have been abundantly verified—in a word, the conclusion would have been forced upon him that many of the teocallis or sacred edifices, with all their fantastical appendages, were identical with the B'hudist temples in the southern parts of India, and in the islands of the Indian Archipelago. And this fact, as before intimated, gives us a clue to the age in which one at least of the most modern of them was built. The great temple of Palenqué so closely corresponds, in its principal details, with that of Bóro-Bódo in the province of Kedú, in the island of Java, as to place beyond all reasonable debate the common purpose and origin of both. Both are elevated on a series of graduated platforms or terraces, and are reached by successive flights of steps facing the cardinal points; the chambers in both are disproportionately small, with no apertures, excepting the doorways, for the admission of air and light; their curved ceilings, formed of stones overlapping each other triangularwise, and constituting what is known as the Cyclopean arch, are precisely

* Hist. of Architecture, vol. ii. p. 761.

alike; the walls of both are adorned with mytho-hieroglyphical tablets, in which the head of the Asiatic elephant is conspicuous,* the meaning of which has yet to be deciphered; and lastly, in the sanctuaries of both, B'huda is represented in colossal dignity, seated cross-legged upon a couch or throne sustained by crouching leopards, and benignly receiving an offering of fruit and flowers from a priestess who is kneeling before him. Mr. Squier, one of the most distinguished archæologists in the States, whilst admitting that coincidences of this kind, 'extending to the ornaments of the Indian and Central American 'temples, monstrous heads, and symbolical figures, might be 'greatly multiplied,' yet doubts whether the religion to which they belonged can be properly regarded as derivative. In our judgment, the several features above described are much too close and exact to be accidental; they denote the successful establishment of B'hudistic worship in both countries, and probably about the same time. A comparison of certain dates and concurrent events will considerably strengthen this supposition, if not confirm it. It is well known that the milder religion of B'huda was introduced into Java at a comparatively recent period, namely, about A.D. 450; and, according to the local tradition, the famous temple of Bóro-Bódo was built in the sixth century of the Javan era, which is seventy-five years in arrear of our own. Now the last-mentioned date synchronises with two most important events in the histories respectively of the eastern and western continents. It was then that the first of the long series of religious wars between the Brahmins and B'hudists occurred, and which ultimately resulted in the defeat of the latter, and their expulsion from the soil of Hindustan; and it was then likewise that various tribes, bigoted followers of Teoyaomiqui, of whom the implacable and sanguinary Kali of the Hindus was the prototype, were successively impelled forward from the north-western deserts of North America, and eventually established themselves and their merciless creed in the valley of Anahuac. If, as the Abbé Clavigero calculates, the Toltecas did not abandon the last-mentioned territory and pass into the provinces to the south of it, later than A.D. 1051, the age of the great temple of Palenqué, at the period of the Spanish conquest, would barely exceed 500 years; and the actual state of the ruins at this time will warrant no higher antiquity.

---

* *Vide* M. de Waldeck's 'Monuments anciens du Mexique et du 'Yucatan,' plate 38. The symbol of the elephant's head likewise occurs as an ornament upon the helmet or cap of a warrior or priest in plate 13.

The Aztecas were an industrious but not an inventive people. As before remarked, they derived their knowledge of the mechanical arts from the former occupants of Mexico, whose models they commonly adopted. In the matter of architecture they seem never to have departed from the primitive types set before them; a circumstance which enables the archæologist to define, at least with presumable exactitude, their geographical limits. The route which they followed, from the west to the east, has been satisfactorily determined, as well as the several spots where they temporarily encamped. It is at the confluence of the Rio Colorado and the Rio Gila that they appear for the first time in American history. Not until they had reached the table-lands of Mexico did they finally abandon their nomadic habits, and become a civilised nation. This sudden and almost instantaneous revolution in their character and pursuits was owing, in all likelihood, to the attractive scenes of organised labour and domestic content that everywhere greeted them when passing, by invitation or otherwise, into the territory since known as New Mexico. That province was not then as now nearly depopulated and a sandy waste. At the period of the Spanish conquest and for many centuries before it, the country was densely peopled, and studded with fortified cities, stone-built villages, and isolated dwellings, surrounded by fruitful orchards and cultivated meadows, and the whole connected by a network of highways. Successive droughts, the result of subterranean combustion, have converted very much of what was once a blooming garden into an arid wilderness. Since its glory has departed but few travellers have ventured into the province in question, and fewer still, so far as we are aware, have interested themselves in the singular remains of antiquity that are scattered along its now almost deserted valleys—remains that mournfully attest the former existence of a numerous and agricultural people but little inferior, probably, to any civilised race of which American history or tradition has preserved a record. Those remains, which have been referred, but without the smallest show of reason, to the skill of the Aztecas, belong to our Intermediate epoch. They exhibit no evidence of the mechanical ability which is so manifest in the construction of the temples and palaces and other works of Mexico. The 'pueblos,' or cities of the Indians, constitute a distinct type of architecture in the New World. The most celebrated of them are the *Casas Grandes*, the use and age of which so much perplexed Von Humboldt. It has since been suggested that they may have served as public granaries in pre-Columbian times. 'Their origin,' says Mr. Bartlett, 'is shrouded in mystery.'

'They were found (he adds) much as they now appear by the earliest explorers of the country, who were told by the Indians that they had been built 500 years before. One thing is evident, that at some former period the valley of the Gila, from this ruin [i.e. the third of the Casas Grandes] to the western extremity of the rich bottom lands now occupied by the Pimas and Coco-Maricopas, as well as the broad valley of the Salinas, for upwards of forty miles, was densely populated. The ruined buildings, the irrigating canals, and the vast quantities of pottery of a superior quality, show that, while they were an agricultural people, they were much in advance of the present semi-civilised tribes of the Gila. But this civilisation extended far beyond the district named. From information given me by Leroux, it appears that ruins of the same sort exist on the San Francisco or Verde River ; and Capt. Johnstone and Major Emory both saw similar evidences of wide-spread population far above the district in question.' *

Pueblos, in fact, are dispersed throughout the country which extends from the banks of the Rio Grande, in New Mexico, to the Gila, the Colorado, and the Vermilion Sea which divides California from New Spain. Some are so ancient that no Indian tradition of the present races makes any mention of them. Each served at once for a city and a fortress. Sometimes they are discovered standing singly or in groups on the plains, and sometimes crowning the summits of perpendicular rocks. In the former case they are generally built of *adoubes*, or sun-dried clay; in the latter, of stone. The most remarkable are the pueblos Pintado and Wejegi, in the narrow pass of Chaco, situated between 35° 56′ 27″ north latitude, and 107° 46′ west longitude, for a description of which we must refer our readers to the pages of the Abbé Domenech (vol. i. p. 379).

As a general rule, the pueblo takes the form of an irregular pyramid, rising by gradations until it reaches an elevation of three or four stories. Old Spanish writers, contemporaries of Cortez, mention some pueblos that rose to the extraordinary height of ten stories. That of Pintado, both in altitude and extent, is comparatively small, much smaller indeed than that of the neighbouring ruins of Wejegi. It boasts but of three stories. Each story, ten feet in height, forms a terrace and a step to the story above, which is attained by means of wooden ladders resting against the wall. The total length of the structure is 130 yards. There are 53 apartments on the ground floor, all opening the one into the other. The miniature doorways constitute a problem in the archæology of architecture which has yet to be solved.

* Explorations in Texas, New Mexico, &c., vol. ii. p. 277.

'The floors are formed of very rough beams 7½ inches in diameter, over which are transversely laid cross-beams of less size; above these is a layer of bark and brush-wood, covered over with mortar. These beams show no mark of having been wrought by axe or saw; they rather appear to have been cut or broken off with some rude instrument more blunt than sharp.'

From the fact of the mortar used throughout this building never having been tempered, we conclude it to be one of the most ancient monuments of the kind in that part of the continent. Elsewhere, as in the district washed by the Salt River and the Gila, the interior walls of the ruined houses are usually stuccoed, or faced 'with a kind of concrete, composed of 'pebbles and white earth, polished and whitened over,' which would seem to be absolutely indestructible; whilst the beams of cedar, often a yard in diameter, bear marks of having been dressed with appropriate tools. Owing to the extreme rarefaction of the atmosphere in these latitudes all descriptions of timber are preserved for an indefinite term; cedar, more especially, hardens with age, till at length it becomes almost as solid as stone. When, therefore, house-beams of that wood are discovered exhibiting signs of decay, as in the ponderous ruins of the Casas Grandes, and in those near the mountains of San Pedro, a high antiquity of the buildings may be confidently inferred.

But old as the erections we have just instanced may be, there are others in these remote regions very much older. They are built of stone, and are doubtless the most primitive specimens of architecture in that material as yet discovered in the New World. Both in their external forms and internal arrangements, they closely resemble the most ancient edifices in Palestine, and such as are attributed to the Kelts in this country. Each structure is circular, being wholly built, too, of rounded stones laid in alternate belts or courses of large and small, and the interstices filled in with kneaded clay. Each, moreover, is encompassed by a solid rampart, sometimes constructed of stone, but more frequently of earth. In these primitive habitations, the apartments of which are numerous, spacious, and oftentimes circular, timber appears to have been entirely dispensed with. Lastly, there are invariably four entrances to each, answering to the four cardinal points. These curious ruins chiefly abound on the banks of the Blue, the Black, and the Salt Rivers. On the last mentioned they are more considerable than elsewhere. Tumuli, truncated pyramids, and wells now choked with débris and enclosed by walls, are also to be met with in the same localities. 'Excavations

'among these majestic ruins,' observes the Abbé Domenech, 'have yielded abundant fragments of beautiful pottery, red, 'yellow, or black, striped, scolloped, and ornamented with 'brilliantly coloured paintings.'

There is another class of primitive structures in the same regions, which deserves something more than a passing notice, namely, the *Estufas*. Whether these are the adjuncts of the more modern pueblos, or of the more ancient circular 'towns,' seems questionable. They are found in close proximity to both, and were once used, it is supposed, as places of meeting for political or religious assemblies. They partake very much of the character of the ancient *cryptæ* of Greece, Sicily, and Sardinia; and in some respects even surpass those of Mycenæ and Minyas.

'Properly speaking (says the Abbé Domenech) these *estufas* are round or square store-rooms, usually situated beneath the soil, like cellars; they are sometimes of large dimensions. The ceiling is supported by enormous pillars of masonry, or made of stout pine-trees. . . . These edifices are generally devoid of door or window, and the only ingress to them is from an aperture at the top. The estufas of the Jemez were rectangular and one story only, being about eight yards and twelve inches wide, by thirty feet high. The interior walls of these edifices are always covered with hieroglyphical paintings and various ornaments. There are pueblos which possess no less than four, and even six, estufas of different sizes. Among the ruins of Hungo-Pavi, near the beautiful plateau of the Mesa-fachada, one of these edifices is found which had at least four stories, buttresses in the interior, and walls a yard thick by thirty feet in height. But, to judge from the rubbish around them, they must once have been much higher. The estufas in the Pueblo-Bonito are sixty yards in circumference, and their walls are regularly formed of layers of small stones alternating with layers of large ones. Between the Great and Little Colorado there is a chain of arenaceous hills, upon the summit of which are immense ruins of pueblos and estufas every way similar to those we have described.' (Vol. i. p. 385.)

Even from our necessarily imperfect account of these interesting monuments in the distant West, which we have relegated to the Intermediate epoch, the reader cannot have failed to perceive that, if not strictly homogeneal in character, they have certain broad features in common. No similar structures are to be found elsewhere on the continent. Nevertheless, according to the traditions of the local Indians, the whole, without exception, resulted from the paternal solicitude, and, in some instances, from the talismanic powers, of Montezuma, the last and greatest of the Mexican incas; whose memory they cherish with a childlike devotion, looking forward

to the time of his reappearance in their midst with as much pride and confidence as did the Britons of old for that of King Arthur, when he will re-assume both his regal and pontifical authority, expel the intruders from his scattered dominions, and restore everything in them to its pristine condition. But after disintegrating the mythic element from the legends of the Indians, the residuum is generally of little worth. All the structures in question are manifestly much older than the Aztec dynasty. Between the simple round houses in the west and the stately edifices in Mexico there is no analogy whatever. The former, as we have already suggested, are the most primitive hitherto discovered in North America, and their prototype most probably was the ordinary tent of the Tartar. To this day that wanderer from the Asiatic heights not only arranges his camp in the form of a circle, but also surrounds it with a mound of earth, to preserve his family and his cattle from the depredations of neighbouring tribes and the nocturnal attacks of wild beasts. The common dwelling of the Chinaman is constructed on a similar principle, and was derived, no doubt, from a similar source.

Those remains which we propose to refer to the Earliest epoch (an arrangement, however, which is not strictly legitimate, much less scientific, but only adopted here for conveniency's sake) are much more diversified in their character, as well as more widely diffused, than the objects already pointed out. They comprise various descriptions of earthworks, stone and other defences, circusses, temples, obelisks, wells, embankments, artificial meadows, and high-roads; besides multifarious works of art, such as sculptures, masks, and statuettes in obsidian and clay, terra-cotta vases, ornaments for the person, implements of war, domestic utensils, tools, &c. Not the whole of these things exclusively appertained to the aboriginal colonists of North America; some belong to their immediate or near descendants, and others again to later descendants, who have not unfrequently added to, or otherwise modified, the labours of their predecessors—the earthworks more especially —to suit their own particular requirements, or in accordance with the prevailing customs, religious and political, of their day. Obviously it is impossible in this place to describe at any length these manifold vestiges of long extinct populations, or even to complete the enumeration of them. We shall select, therefore, such only as will best serve, in our judgment, to illustrate the natural history of civilisation in the New World anterior to its conquest by the Old.

Of the earthworks, the first both in order of time and

of interest, are the mounds, usually raised on the alluvion of a lake, river, or stream, and sometimes covering from two to eight acres of ground, and exceeding one hundred feet or more in height. Their well-defined order of succession probably indicates the main routes taken by the primitive occupants of the country. It has been said that they may be counted 'by thousands and by tens of thousands.'* They vary so much in their external features and construction as almost to defy classification. Some are conical, some pyramidal, some dome-shaped, and others again in the form of animals, birds, and reptiles; a few resemble the figure of a man. They are scattered from Lake Erie to the Gulf of Mexico, increasing in number, size, and grandeur as they descend farther south. But they are nowhere so systematically
as in the great valleys of the Mississippi and Ohio. In the extreme western and north-eastern States of the Union they are comparatively rare, whilst Canada is totally destitute of them. Contrary to the general rule in the Old World, the American mounds are not simply tumuli erected in honour of the dead; they were destined to various and very opposite uses; e.g. they served for 'high places,' for temple foundations, for sacrificial altars, for observatories, as well as for sepulchres. Both anterior and subsequent to the Spanish conquest, many of them, more particularly in the Gulf States, were crowned with the palaces of caciques and other illustrious personages, which afterwards served for their tombs or cenotaphs; and which accounts in some measure for their superior construction, as well as for their better state of preservation. In the provinces farther south, every known variety of the pyramidal mound has been discovered, from the more simple dagôba or tôpe,† common in Ceylon and Hindustan, to

* It is proper to mention that, in the judgment of the most eminent geologists, the *stratified* mounds in the western States are not the works of man, but the results of diluvial and fluviatile action.

† 'The ancient edifices of Chichen, in Central America, (remarks 'Mr. Hardy, the missionary,) bear a very striking resemblance to the 'tôpes of India. The shape of one of the domes, its apparent size, 'the small tower on the summit, the trees growing on the sides, the 'appearance of masonry here and there, the shape of the ornaments, 'and the small doorway at the base, are so exactly similar to what I 'have seen at Anarajapoora [the ancient capital of Ceylon], that 'when my eyes fell on the engravings of these remarkable ruins I 'supposed that they were presented in illustration of the dagôbas of 'Ceylon.' (*Eastern Monachism*, p. 222.) The date of the oldest of the Singalese dagôbas is 300 B.C.

the loftier structure which in its primitive grandeur must have rivalled the most famous in Egypt. In the north, bordering on the great lakes, two very opposite types occur—namely, the dome-shaped and the emblematical, both constructed of earth. The first resemble in every respect the well-known Keltic barrows of this country, but are sometimes on a scale equal to those of the Scandinavian nations; the second are quite unique, and have been described not inaptly as 'immense 'bassi-relievi carved on the soil by the hands of giants.' Their origin is unknown, but the relics found within them betoken a very high antiquity. Locally each is called a *totem*, a corruption of *do-daim*, an Algonquin term signifying 'town-mark.' In the valley of the Ohio the mounds are in shape both conical and pyramidal, of larger dimensions and more symmetrical than elsewhere, excepting of course those in Mexico and other centres of more advanced civilisation. Nevertheless, between the last-mentioned and the countless earth-mounds of Ohio there are such close analogies as to make it highly probable that both originated with the same people, although probably both were not erected in the same era.

For the purposes of historical deduction the sacred and sacrificial mounds are far more important than any others of the series. The former abound in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, and in the great valley of the Mississippi, whilst the latter are restricted to no particular locality, being met with almost as frequently in the north as in the south. 'In some instances,' observes Mr. Squier, 'they are terraced, or have successive 'stages; but whatever their form, whether round, oval, oc-'tangular, square, or oblong, they have invariably flat or level 'tops of greater or less area.' They are usually approached by imposing graded avenues, and encompassed by ramparts of earth or walls of Cyclopean masonry. Some of these temple-mounds are upon a truly gigantic scale. That for instance at Cahokia, in Illinois, is reported to be 700 feet long, 500 feet wide at the base, and 90 feet in height; its solid contents have been roughly estimated at 20,000,000 cubic feet. An immense tetragonal terrace has been reared by the side of it, which is reached by means of a talus. This mound is constructed with as much regularity as any of the *teocallis* in the south, and was originally cased with stone (some American archæologists maintain with brick), and surmounted with one or more buildings.* The sacrificial mounds, which are peculiar to the New World, are much less imposing structures than the temple-

* *Vide* Archæ. Amer. i. 243.

mounds. Each is crowned with a symmetrical altar of burnt clay or stone, on which are deposited numerous relics, in all instances exhibiting traces of their having been exposed to the action of fire. They are still occasionally used in the religious ceremonies of the Indians encamped near their sites.

The art of castrametation appears to have been more extensively as well as more successfully practised in ancient times by the nations of North America than by their more advanced contemporaries in the Old World. In no quarter of the latter, at all events, are there so many or such complicated military monuments to be found. From the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains a perpetual succession of vast entrenched camps and colossal fortifications, in earth and stone, follow the entire route. Every eminence is defended, as well as every delta formed by the junction of two streams. Redoubts and breastworks, ramparts and circumvallations, mounds of observation, and—anachronistic as it seems—*casemates* (as in the ruins of Marietta, near the mouth of the Muskingum) attest equally to the number, the skill, and the industry of the population which constructed them. The most perfect and characteristic, as well as the most eminent of these stupendous defences, are to be met with in the State of Ohio. A brief description of those in the county of Licking must here suffice:—

'Between the delta formed by the Newark and the Racoon there is a perpendicular table-land about thirty-five feet high, upon which regular fortifications of great extent are built. On the west side of the platform is an octangular fort, enclosing a space of about forty acres, with walls about nine feet in height, and of equal breadth. This fort was entered by eight gates about five yards in width, each protected by a tumulus placed in the interior in front of the entrances. Two parallel walls lead to another circular fort, placed south-west of the first, covering a space of twenty-two acres. Proceeding towards the south, you see an observatory that commands almost all the extent upon which these divers constructions are erected. Beneath the observatory a secret passage leads to the bank of the Racoon. Farther to the right is a third fort, also circular, of about twenty-six acres, with an interior moat, out of which the earth was taken to form the walls of the fort, which are about twenty-five or thirty feet high. Two other parallel walls, very distant from each other at this place, run to the north, gradually diminishing their distance, and terminate at another fort, of quadrangular shape, twenty acres in extent. These four different forts are connected by rather low walls, and in the centre is a shallow pond covering a superficies of 150 or 200 acres, which probably afforded water to the flocks collected within the wide enclosure. Towers of observation are placed from distance to distance on the rising points of the plateau.'*

* Deserts of North America, vol. i. p. 373.

As already intimated, the objects of primitive art and utility which have been discovered in the ruins of buildings, or exhumed from the tumuli, are extremely miscellaneous in their character; differing, according to the resources of the particular locality and the genius of the various natives. In the southern and north-western provinces greater mechanical skill and superior taste are, as a rule, perceptible in every description of handiwork. But two classes of objects are equally distributed over the whole continent; namely, ornaments for the person in copper, and various utensils in pottery. Copper, in its virgin state, obtained from the vicinity of the Great Lakes, and hammered into the forms of bracelets, anklets, axes, mauls, &c., appears to have been in very general use from an early period. Silver, lead, and iron were also worked, but on a limited scale; whilst brass and bronze, the former in the north, and the latter in the south, were more extensively employed. A few years ago the corpse of a warrior was discovered in one of the sepulchral mounds in the streets of Marietta, Ohio, with the remains of a baldrick or buckler, 'composed of copper overlaid with a thick plate of 'silver,' lying across his breast. By his side were several broken pieces of copper tubing, 'filled with iron rust'—all, in fact, that remained of his scabbard and sword. A piece of iron ore, 'which had the appearance of having been vitrified,' was likewise found with them. In reference to this discovery, Mr. Squier remarks: 'These articles have been critically 'examined, and it is beyond doubt that the bosses are abso-'lutely *plated*, not simply overlaid, *with silver*' (p. 188). But we can hardly accept this conclusion. The effect described was produced more likely by chemical action; in other words, the metals had become partially amalgamated by the lapse of time. The presence, however, of oxydised steel or iron, as well as a specimen of 'vitrified iron ore,' in the same monument, is a much more interesting and important fact than the other; it betokens an advanced knowledge of metallurgy in very primitive times—a knowledge which must have been lost to succeeding generations, and long anterior to the age of the conquest. Iron was then absolutely unknown in the New World, excepting to one solitary tribe, established at the mouth of the La Plata, whose arrows and spears were tipped with it. But of all the aboriginal arts that of pottery had attained to the highest degree of perfection. The terra-cotta vases have been compared in form with the choicest antique specimens in Europe. Those found in the pueblos and wells of New Mexico 'still retain' (says the Abbé Domenech) 'a very

'perfect varnish; they are ornamented with brilliant paintings, 'lines, scallops, frogs, butterflies, tortoises, and monkeys' heads.' In the States to the east of the Mississippi they are almost equally excellent. Yet it has been questioned whether the aborigines were acquainted with the potter's wheel. Besides a large assortment of cinerary urns, many of Old World types, arrow-heads of rock crystal, agate, and silex, copper and stone axes, hatchets, gouges, and chisels, knives in obsidian, perforated shells—some from the Gulf shores, and others from the southern coasts of India—the most ancient of the mounds have also yielded bracelets of brass, smooth and polished, rings and tubes of the same material, various ornaments for the person in silver, pipes of terra-cotta, slate, and steatite, rude sculptures in wood, and finer sculptures in more durable materials, representing tropical quadrupeds, birds, fishes, &c.

'The arts of taste and luxury may decline and perish through 'the violence, the revolutions, and disasters to which nations 'are exposed; but the arts necessary to life cannot be lost by 'a people who has once known them.' But this maxim of Principal Robertson has again been abundantly contradicted in the social history of the New World. All Spanish writers, at the time of the conquest, concur in describing the Indians generally as an intelligent and industrious, an inoffensive and religious people, as well in the interior as on the sea-board of the continent. Since the occupation of the north-eastern provinces by the Anglo-Saxon race, the aborigines have degenerated so greatly from their primitive condition, and diminished so rapidly in number, as to make their total extinction within a very limited period a matter of absolute certainty. Two centuries ago the population north of the confines of ancient Mexico amounted to 17,000,000 souls; it is now less than 2,000,000. Alcoholic liquors, epidemical diseases, and forced emigrations have aggravated this frightful mortality. Yet notwithstanding their deportation, and the various calamities incidental to it, many of the surviving families of the Redskins have preserved in their new settlements some knowledge of the several arts that were practised by their more fortunate ancestors. From the remotest times, agriculture appears to have been systematically prosecuted in the western hemisphere on the largest scale. The former vast populations on the upper valleys of the Mississippi and Ohio were probably dependent, in part if not wholly, on the northern aborigines for their necessary supplies of corn. The configuration and extent of their 'garden-beds' or farms, more especially in the States of Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan, are clearly discernible to this day, and are reported

to be 'laid out with all the neatness and symmetry of modern 'husbandry.' Some of these 'garden-beds' cover an area of several hundred acres. Similar skill and industry are observable in the arrangement and cultivation of the lands belonging to the Delawares and other expatriated tribes on the banks of the Canadian rivers, and on the prairies of Kansas. So likewise with the primitive arts of pottery and glass-making, spinning and weaving, each of which is still extensively practised by the Pimas and other tribes. Even to the present day, according to the report of the latest traveller amongst them, the Navajos, Zunis, and the Jemez manufacture woollen and cotton tissues which are highly prized by their white neighbours. There is no authenticated instance, we believe, of any Indian tribe or family having lapsed into 'a state of nature.' All have been more or less contaminated—and some, like the powerful and highly civilised Natchez, hopelessly ruined and degraded—by contact with the *Parthis mendaciores* infesting their country; but none, as yet, have sunk into absolute barbarism. Numbers excepted, they are now in many respects what they were in the sixteenth century. The conquest of the New World by the Spaniards, and its gradual occupation by successive races of white men, have checked the development, but not destroyed the primitive institutions of the Indians. For aught, indeed, that can be urged to the contrary, they have been stationary for a much longer period; and having been excluded from intercourse with the outer world, have become at length, what we find them, a fossilised people, like that of China.

That the tribes of New Mexico inherited a civilisation, more or less perfect, from extinct races which occupied that country before them is an indisputable fact. No barbarous nation or nations could have executed the structural monuments that have been partially described, or have fabricated the multifarious works of art that are daily brought to light. Both the one and the other establish the early existence of a settled, industrious, and, to some extent, cultivated people. Whence, then, did that people derive their practical knowledge of the useful arts, and all the concomitants of ancient civilised life? Or, were these things really, as not a few imagine, of cis-Atlantic origin? That inquiry depends upon another and much more pertinent one—namely, were the primitive occupants of the northern continent of America immigrants or autochthones? Ethnographers, naturalists, and archæologists have attempted in vain to solve these problems; scarcely two of them are of the same opinion. As yet, no satisfactory hypothesis has

been framed for general acceptance. Scandinavia, Gaul, Mauritania, Carthage, Egypt, Palestine, Hindustan, China, Mongolia, Siberia, and even Wales and Ireland, are supposed by some to have furnished their respective quotas towards the peopling of the New World; whilst others, including the late Dr. Morton, of New York, have maintained that the ancient population was a distinct type of humanity, indigenous to the soil. That celebrated craniologist, indeed, went far ahead of his contemporaries, and divided the aboriginal American races into two families—the Toltecan natives and the barbarous tribes—which differed, he contended, as essentially in their physical as in their moral characteristics. But since the publication of his well-known 'Crania Americana,' several important ethnological discoveries have been made elsewhere on the continent, in the south more especially, which completely sweep away his favourite, or rather sole, criterion of intellectual capacity—the development of the facial angle. The traditions of the Indians are much too vague and conflicting to resolve a doubt, much less to establish a theory, in the matter of their ancestry. True, some of them—as, for example, the Algonquins, the Athapascans, the Ioways, and the Pimas, all widely separated from each other—uniformly point to the rising sun as the direction whence their forefathers came; but this motion may only indicate that they migrated from the eastern extremity of the continent, and not from the eastern hemisphere. In some instances it undoubtedly means no more than that they are the boasted posterity or the adopted children of a divine personage, who is supposed to have emanated from the great luminary. The Quichés alone have preserved anything like a definite account of their origin; and what makes this fact the more remarkable is, that they have been established in Central America from immemorial time. According to their earliest traditions their progenitors travelled from the east, making a perilous journey through ice-fields and in protracted darkness; from which circumstances it has been inferred by the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg and others that they must necessarily have passed into the American continent either by some Arctic route, or by the Aleutian Isles in the depth of winter. To ourselves this tradition appears more curious than important. Visitors' tales of frost-bound seas and of days without a sunrise would naturally make a very deep impression upon the minds of a people confined within the tropics; who, in the course of time, would not unlikely associate such extraordinary phenomena with the personal history of their remote ancestors, and thus cast a thicker veil of mystery over it

or add a fresh marvel to it. Of the innumerable tribes or families of Indians still in existence, not one has any conception, much less any traditional knowledge of a single country in the Old World. The geographical notions of the most intelligent amongst them are bounded by their own horizon. So far as is now known, the ancient Mexicans were the solitary exceptions to this rule. That they crossed over from Asia by the Aleutian Isles, about the eleventh century of our era, is a fact established as well by the declaration of the last of their Incas to his Spanish conquerors, as by the curious geographical chart of their migration preserved by Boturini.*

'Dim as these traditions are (observes Mr. Schoolcraft) they shed some light on the thick historical darkness which shrouds the period. They point decidedly to a foreign, to an oriental, if not Shemetic, origin. Such an origin has been inferred from the first. At whatever point the investigation has been made, the eastern hemisphere has been found to contain the physical and mental prototypes of the race. Language, mythology, religious dogmas, the very style of architecture, and their calendar, as far as it is developed, point to that fruitful and central source of human dispersion and nationality.' †

Whilst allowing there has been, for ages, a continuous immigration from the east of Asia—a fact, indeed, which is abundantly evidenced as well by the physical characteristics of the Indian tribes occupying the mighty deserts in the north and north-west, as by their manners, customs, and traditions, which so closely resemble those of the Mongols on the neighbouring continent—it is, we think, equally demonstrable that other colonists, more civilised than wandering hordes of Tartars, found their way thither directly across the Pacific. In possession of the magnet, the most ancient of the eastern nations boldly navigated the wide ocean in vessels of great burden; whilst as yet the nations in the west were timidly following the sinuosities of their coasts in shallow canoes or on ruder rafts. Some of the natives of India, like the 'godlike' Phæacians whom Homer extols, were enterprising merchants and hardy mariners from the remotest antiquity. And so, no doubt, were the maritime populations of the Eastern Archipelago. If the oldest Japanese maps are to be depended on, their voyages formerly extended to Java, and on the north to Behring's Straits and to the coast of America, which they called Foosang

* Mr. Fergusson holds that the Toltecs represent *the Esquimaux*, and that the Aztecs were Red Indians; but we cannot discover any ground for this theory.

† Indian Tribes of the United States, vol. i. p. 26.

—a name by which it was also known to the Chinese long prior to the Christian era.

The oldest traditions of the Peruvians, the Brazilians, and the Araucanians (the aborigines of Valdivia) refer to the arrival in their countries respectively of illustrious strangers who came from afar, across the ocean. Only on the supposition that more frequent intercourse, by water, was maintained between the several nations of antiquity than is usually conceded by modern ethnographers and others, is it possible to account for the intermixture of races and the similarity of customs and institutions observable in different quarters of the globe. For example, families that physically approximate in type to the Redskins of North America have been discovered on the eastern coast of Africa, on the island of Madagascar, on the South Australian continent, as well as scattered throughout Polynesia. And so, too, a very close conformity existed between the religious creeds and practices of the Etrurians and the Aztecas. In Italy and America human sacrifices were customary at the graves of illustrious chieftains. In the former country they were superseded by gladiatorial exhibitions—which were also introduced into Mexico—but, as in Etruria, were only used upon certain religious occasions. With both, too, the olive-branch was the symbol of peace. These analogies might be almost indefinitely extended. The calendars of the two people were nearly alike; the one calculated the length of the year at 365 days, 5 hours, and 50 minutes, the other at 10 minutes less. Like other nations of antiquity, they both believed that at the end of certain astronomical cycles periodical changes in nature would occur, and these were watched therefore with intense anxiety and alarm. The passage of the Pleiades across the meridian was announced to trembling multitudes in Mexico by the simultaneous lighting of innumerable beacon-fires on the observatories and hill-tops; and the reappearing of the great luminary in the morning, which confirmed their lease of life, was the signal for mutual congratulations and rejoicings. That momentous holiday corresponded with the festival of Isis, which, according to Herodotus, originated under precisely similar circumstances.*

These parallelisms link the primeval history of America with that of the Old World, and the farther we prosecute them the evidence of the fact becomes proportionately stronger, till at length it is impossible to resist it. It was a maxim of the traveller, Clarke, that by proper attention to the vestiges of

* Euter. 122–4.

ancient superstition, we are enabled to refer a whole people to their original ancestors with more certainty than by observations made upon their language; because the superstition is engrafted upon the stock, but the language is liable to change. As, therefore, with the Hindus, Egyptians, Assyrians, Scythians, and their offshoots in Europe, so with all the tribes of the northern continent, from Nicaragua to the borders of Lake Superior, as well as throughout New England, the adoration of the sun, as the symbol of divine intelligence, has prevailed from the earliest epoch to this day.

'It may be traced in America (says Mr. Squier) from its simplest or least clearly defined form among the roving hunters and squalid Esquimaux of the North, through every intermediate stage of development, to the imposing systems of Mexico and Peru, where it took a form nearly corresponding with that which it at one time sustained on the banks of the Ganges and on the plains of Assyria.' *

Associated with Sabæan worship in former times was that of the lingham or phallus. This well-attested fact leaves little room for doubting that the aboriginal Americans derived their religious system in part from the East. The worship of the lingham was flourishing in the cities of Pomeco and Tlascalla, in Mexico, at the period of the conquest; and Mr. Stephens observed at Uxmal, in Yucatan, certain ornaments upon the external cornice of several large buildings, the meaning of which was too plainly sculptured to be misunderstood (*Travels*, vol. i. p. 181). Nor was this revolting worship restricted to the territories just indicated; it appears to have been equally prevalent in the Gulf States, and as far north as Tennessee, where innumerable characteristic images have been ploughed up; some formed of clay, and others carved out of a kind of amphibolic rock, the toughest of all stony substances.

Bearing in mind that the Oriental nations acknowledged originally but one object of devotion, the sun; with which they presently associated the doctrines of the reciprocal principles of nature—doctrines which passed from India into Ethiopia and Egypt, thence into Asia Minor, and so into Greece and Rome—it is impossible to withhold from the inhabitants of the western hemisphere the coveted distinction of the highest antiquity, when we find their remote ancestors possessing the same system of theology, and adopting the same objects of worship, as the most ancient and cultivated people of the Old World. With almost all the aborigines, there is a proof of the existence of a belief in a Supreme Being; of an extensive poly-

* Amer. Archæ. Res., p. 18.

theism, based in its origin upon the principle of divine emanations; of a belief in the immortality of the soul and its future state; and in the transmigration of spirits. The agreement between their ritualistic observances is equally remarkable. They, too, had sacred ablutions and fasts, sacrifices and expiatory self-punishments. Notwithstanding what has oftentimes been urged to the contrary, this congruity of religious ideas and practices in both hemispheres is of so decisive a character as to demonstrate a single primitive source. 'We cannot,' remarks Sir William Jones, 'justly conclude by arguments 'preceding the proof of facts, that one idolatrous people must 'have borrowed their deities, rites, and tenets from another; 'since gods of all shapes and dimensions may be framed by the 'boundless powers of imagination, or by the frauds and follies 'of men, in countries never connected; but when features of 'resemblance too strong to have been accidental are observable 'in different systems of polytheism, without fancy or prejudice 'to colour them and improve their likeness, we can scarcely 'help believing that some connexion has in immemorial time 'subsisted between the several nations which have adopted 'them.' (*Works*, vol. i. p. 229.) There are now no means of determining at what particular epoch in the world's history the worship of the Lingham in India, of Peor-Apis in Egypt, of the Phallus in Greece, or Priapus in Rome, originated. But according to the received chronology of the Bible, the worship of Baal-Peor prevailed among the Moabites 1450 B.C. (Numb. xxv. 3), or long before it was received into Europe. From the remains which are still in existence it may have passed into America at a time coeval with its introduction into Egypt. And this fact brings us to a still higher point in the primitive history of the continent.

Pyramidal piles of earth and stone are the peculiar marks by which we may discover the sites of the earliest settlements of mankind. The idea of such piles first appeared in the valley of the Euphrates, and culminated in the valley of the Nile. Whatever their forms, or wherever situated, in Asia or in Africa, one condition is common to them all: intended primarily for astronomical observatories, the sides of each accurately correspond with the cardinal points. This is also the case with the pyramids of America. In determining the epoch of the aboriginal migration to that continent, this remarkable coextension or analogy again carries us back to that period when mankind, after being dissipated in the plains of Shinar, had re-established themselves in different quarters of the globe, We have already referred to the magnificent pyramidal struc-

tures of Mexico; which, excepting the shrines, were undoubtedly the work of the Toltecans, if not of an earlier people: but be that as it may, there are pyramidal ruins in Yucatan and Central America of a much more ancient date than any to be found elsewhere in the New World—so ancient, indeed, as to compare with similar monuments in Egypt, which are generally ascribed to the Memphite period. If, as we believe, the New World borrowed its designs for such structures, the aborigines must have travelled to the valley of the Nile for that purpose, rather than brought them from the shores of the Euxine and Caspian Seas—a circumstance which, we may remark by the way, shows them to have been not only a less cultivated but a later settled nation than the Egyptians. Their conventional ideas of pictography and sculpture point to the same origin. According to Sir Gardner Wilkinson, no signs of progress from infancy to the more advanced stages of art are perceptible on the earliest monuments of Egypt: it was in after-times the Egyptian sculptors bound themselves so rigidly to conventional forms in the human figure. And so in America, the most ancient remains exhibit similar characteristics. The same unalterable forms satisfied the devotion or the taste of successive generations; and consequently no improvement was made upon them. In the types of primitive art, the New World merely reflected the light of the Old. Hence there was no warmth or creative power in it. Generation after generation servilely copied each other, but with gradually diminishing skill, or in almost the exact ratio of the distance which separated them from Central America and Yucatan, the earliest seats of civilisation on the continent. That Africa, not the East, was the original source of their inspiration—perhaps about the age of the fourth Egyptian dynasty—may be inferred, partly from the peculiar situations, internal economy, and identical embellishment of the structures in question, and partly from the most primitive mode of sepulture observable in the immediate vicinity of them. The pile is invariably erected, for the purpose of sacred ablutions, in close proximity to water; either on the bank of a stream, or on the shore of a lake, or, in the absence of these, an artificial pond of proportionate dimensions has been excavated at its base; central apartments, for the preservation of the sacred element, reached by descending galleries at a particular angle of declination, are found in all of them, as well as a secret communication with the river, lake, or pond, usually by means of a subterranean passage: and lastly, the neighbouring valley or plain, as the case may be, is filled with innumerable

catacombs, in many localities hewed out of the solid rock. The great pyramid on the plateau of Caernavaca, and known as Xochicalco, 'the house of flowers,' is reported to be scarcely distinguishable from the ordinary type of those in Lower Egypt. Its position and configuration show it to be one of the group of adjacent hills. It is truncated and divided into four terraces.

'The intermediate slopes (says Mr. Norman) are covered with platforms, bastions, pyramidal and rectangular elevations and stages, one above another, all faced with large porphyry stones admirably cut, but joined together without cement; the perpendicular height is estimated to be from 300 to 380 feet. The construction of the stories is irregularly like the Egyptian style of architecture; the lower parts inclining inwards at an angle of 15° for a short distance, and then being surmounted with perpendicular courses projecting over the inferior portion. Upon the stories of this pyramid are many figures sculptured in relief, some representing hieroglyphic signs, and others human figures seated cross-legged in Asiatic manner, and crocodiles spouting water.'

Want of space precludes our pursuing these architectural analogies any farther; suffice it to say, therefore, that the distinction between the earlier and later pyramidal temples of the New World is quite as remarkable as that between the ancient Egyptian structure and those erected by the Greek colonists under the Ptolemies. No doubt, very many of the earliest piles have been modified in subsequent ages, to suit the particular necessities or tastes of the people; yet, in every such instance, the archaic type has been but slightly departed from, whilst the primitive example in the decorations without, always emblematical of the worship conducted within, has been scrupulously followed to the last. This is very apparent in the magnificent ruins of Yucatan; where, according to the unanimous reports of Mr. Stephens and later travellers in that wonderful country, the serpent entwined about the stem of the lotus is frequently repeated on the friezes of the temples; and at Palenqué, also, 'a rectangular square is sur-
'rounded by cloisters . . . and lighted by windows bearing
'the exact form of the Egyptian face.'

It is proverbial among Transatlantic travellers, that he who has seen one tribe has seen all; so closely do individuals of every family resemble each other, notwithstanding their immense geographical dissemination, and those differences of climate which embrace the extremes of heat and cold.* And

* *Vide* Mr. J. S. Phillips's Essay on the Physical Type of the American Indians, Schoolcraft, vol. ii. p. 316.

after devoting a lifetime to the investigation of their linguistic affinities, the late venerable Albert Galatin arrived at the same conclusion. 'However differing in their vocabularies,' he remarks, 'there is an evident similarity in the structure of all 'the American languages.'* From whatever land the aboriginal population of North America proceeded—from Eastern Siberia, by the passage of Behring's Straits, or by the Aleutian Islands; or, which we conceive to be much more probable, from the Bactrian heights or Hindustan, by the Indian and Pacific Oceans,—the influence of their genius, mythology, and civilisation has not wholly declined to this day. Hence many have likewise been led to believe in the unity of the American races. Without impeaching the justice of this opinion, so far as it affects the existing tribes of native Red Indians, we cannot but think that the aboriginal occupants of the soil disappeared long before the advent of the Spaniards. So far as is now known, the highest civilised races, at the era of the conquest, were restricted to the territory falling within the 10th and 25th degrees of north latitude, and to that smaller region which is watered by the Rio Colorado and the Rio Gila, and their tributaries. Every other portion of the continent, with one notable exception, was occupied by indigent and semi-barbarous tribes, widely scattered, and subsisting for the most part on the produce of the chace. The exception was Kentucky, bearing the ominous appellation of 'the dark and bloody ground,' which had long been shunned by every Indian with superstitious dread. According to the traditions of the locality, the now attractive banks of the Ohio had been the scene of a frightful carnage, many centuries before the arrival of the Europeans. An entire nation, both physically and morally distinguished from the Redskins—'white men'—and who had been settled in the country from time immemorial, were unexpectedly assailed and overwhelmed by their enemies. The manifest incompletion of several of the monuments in the valley betoken a sudden cessation of labour on the part of their constructors, and thus far confirms the terrible reality of the Indian legends. If those ill-fated people were not the true aborigines of the soil, they were undoubtedly connected with them, as may be inferred from the peculiarity of many of their structures; the relics exhumed from their tumuli; and, above all, from their primeval mode of sepulture.

In the absence of documentary proofs and positive evidence

* Trans. Amer. Ethnol. Soc. vol. ii. p. 367.

it is extremely difficult, and often impossible, to determine the aboriginal migrations of a people. The primary immigrants of North America are no exception to this general rule. They arrived in the New World, we believe, by various routes and at various epochs. That comparatively narrow territory which stretches from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico, and which is so especially rich in stupendous and highly-decorated monuments, many of them bearing indisputable marks of the hoariest antiquity, was the first abode of the civilised nations. Those nations, as Mr. Tylor argues on *à priori* grounds,* brought their civilisation with them; it was not of indigenous growth; and the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, who has laboured long as a missionary in that part of the continent, as well as in the interests of ethnographical science, inclines to the opinion that the Mayas of Yucatan are their degenerate descendants. Thence population was diffused and radiated through the immense regions of the North. Almost the same combination of mounds, terraces, and pyramids is found throughout the valley of the Mississippi as at Copan, Palenqué, and Uxmal; a fact which goes far to prove that the inhabitants of the interior derived their civil as well as their religious institutions, and such knowledge of the arts as they possessed, from Central America. The one, no doubt, was a modification of the other. By one of those refluxes, which were so common in the early history of mankind, the tide of population returned to its original source, but by a circuitous or north-westerly channel; commingling in its passage with several streams of later immigrants to the continent, by Behring's Straits or the Aleutian Isles. Hence the cause of those national changes and revolutions which may be faintly traced on the face of the most primitive monuments, and which are most distinctly portrayed on the more modern ones. The mild religious services of the first ages were superseded by the sanguinary ritual in vogue at the time of the conquest; political domination had completely succumbed to sacerdotal rule; the Inca added to his other functions those of supreme pontiff. Such, in brief, we take to have been the main courses of population in North America. No doubt there were many intermigrations, of more or less importance, the order of which, however, it is impossible to indicate. In connexion with these we may remark, by the way, that no existing tribe of Indians, located east of the Mississippi, lay claim to the monuments surrounding them. According to their several traditions, they found them much in the same condition

* Anahuac, pp. 191, &c.

as they now appear, when their forefathers, centuries ago, 'arrived from the west' and possessed themselves of the country. Old societies had utterly perished ages before, leaving posterity ignorant not only of the extent of their dominions, but also of their very titles. The Atlantic sea-board, from New England to South Carolina, would seem to have been but sparsely peopled till within a comparatively recent epoch. The remains in that long slip of territory are much less numerous than elsewhere on the continent; and, for historical deduction, almost valueless. Nearly the whole of them are the supposed works of the Iroquois and their affiliated tribes, and do not possess, it is reported, 'an antiquity very far back of the Discovery.'

Thus have we travelled over nearly the entire area of North America, and pointed out, in our necessarily hasty passage, the sites of the most important and interesting structural monuments pertaining, as we believe, to at least three distinct and widely separated epochs in the pre-Columbian history of the continent. These edifices show, partly from their architectural and other peculiarities, and partly from the relic of art discovered within and about them, whence sprang their authors, the aboriginal occupants of the soil. Their immediate origin is, and probably ever will be, an open question. It reaches back to the remotest period of human history, and is involved in a haze of fable. Nevertheless, their creeds, usages, and legends, whether delineated on the monuments or reflected by succeeding generations, uniformly point to an Oriental source; and this is all that can be averred with absolute certainty concerning them.

Art. III.—1. *Der Deutsche Krieg im Jahr* 1866. *Nos.* 45 *to* 51 *of Die Grenzboten.* Leipzig: 1866.

2. *Der Krieg von* 1866 *in Deutschland und Italien.* Von W. Rüstow. Zürich: 1866.

3. *Die Theilnahme der II. Armee unter dem Ober-Commando S. K. H. des Kron-Prinzen von Preussen am Feldzuge von* 1866. Berlin: 1866. (Major von Verdy.)

4. *Geschichte der Preussischen Feldzüge von* 1866. Von C. von Winterfeld. Potsdam: 1867.

Contemporary opinion has hitherto been unanimous in holding that the victories of Prussia on the battle-fields of Bohemia were due to the better generalship of her commanders, the superior education and organisation of her men, and the

greater efficiency of her weapons. It is not to be denied that public opinion, in the main, has received correct impressions; but history will not be satisfied with a general verdict. Archives and correspondence will be ransacked at future periods to ascertain on which of the Prussian commanders rests most conspicuously the honour of these victories, on which of them the responsibility of extraordinary accidents and mistakes. The works at the head of this article will help us to a part of the truth in this respect; and if the information they contain be added to that which we have collected from private sources, we may hope to place before our readers a more accurate and novel picture of some of the principal events of the war, in lieu of the dazzling outline which was traced with singular ability and power by the writers who followed one of the divisions of the victorious army.

Bearing in mind that we recently treated of the armament and organisation of Prussian troops in an article on the Military Growth of Prussia, we shall, in this place, pass over many questions which otherwise might have forced themselves upon our attention; and we shall confine ourselves to points particularly illustrating the strategy of the campaign. We shall also cast a side glance at the battle-fields of Central and Southern Germany, on which several striking errors of military judgment were redeemed, as well as in Bohemia, by still more striking blunders on the other side; for this campaign illustrates anew the well-known *dictum* that the conduct of war being usually a succession of mistakes, victory inclines to the general who commits the least and the fewest of them. Some of the assertions and observations we shall have occasion to make will probably excite surprise, for they are at variance with many preconceived notions and existing impressions. Of these statements we shall only say that nothing will be advanced in the following pages which does not rest on the authority of officers who were actively engaged in the preparation or the conduct of the campaign.

Probably many of our readers will be surprised to be told at the outset that no one in Prussia was more averse from the risks of a great war in Germany than King William; that no one in Prussia was so sensitively alive to the danger of a defeat. The plan of a great aggressive movement was foreign to his mind; nor is it strange that under these circumstances the idea of acting on the defensive should have remained so long and persistently a part of his conception of hostilities. The positions held by the Austrians between Theresienstadt, Prague, Josephstadt, and Pardubitz, at the close of May,

seemed to foreshadow an advance through Dresden towards Berlin; and the wide-stretched cantonment of Prussian troops in Silesia, the marches, and the province of Saxony, proves the intention of the King to await his enemy, and then to concentrate his forces.

When, towards the beginning of June, the Austrians threw six army corps under Benedek into Austrian Silesia, leaving Clam Gallas alone in Bohemia, the dislocation of the 2nd army under the Crown Prince of Prussia was of a defensive nature, consisting merely in the assumption of a strong position about the small Silesian fortress of Neisse. We shall not stop to inquire minutely why Benedek withdrew from Bohemia instead of advancing into Saxony. It has been stated with every appearance of truth that the field-marshal, though not as well prepared as he should have been, might have taken the offensive, and would have done so, had he not been prevented by the diplomacy of the Cabinet of Vienna. During the negotiations opened with Bavaria, one of the conditions to which Austria consented was that no aggressive advance should be made. Benedek was thus forced to change his front and commit a blunder in strategy against his will; and in spite of his boasted independence as generalissimo, he was subject in questions of the highest moment to the directions of his political superiors. If, however, he is blameless in this respect, he is less so as regards his subsequent military movements. He very properly argued that his own abandonment of the offensive must necessarily be followed by a corresponding change in the enemy's plans, but by giving credit to the Prussians for immediate decision he mistook the defensive attitude of the Crown Prince about Neisse for part of a vast scheme involving an advance of the enemy through Upper Silesia towards Vienna. Even had this been so, his apprehensions ought not to have prevented the formation of the Austrian main body about Pardubitz.

We shall not pause to consider in detail the causes which led Prussia to exchange her defensive for an offensive attitude. The concentration of the Crown Prince about Neisse began on the 10th of June. On the 16th General Bever set foot upon the frontier of Electoral Hesse, General Herwarth crossed into Saxony, Generals Vogel and Manteuffel invaded Hanover. Time must elapse before the world becomes fully acquainted with the springs by which these matters were conducted. It is sufficient for the present purpose to notice the facts.

The occupation of Saxony immediately altered the plans of Benedek. He began to move leisurely out of Austrian Silesia

back again into Bohemia, half surprised by the rapidity with which the Prussians had gained a broad basis of operations on a semicircle extending from Bautzen through Görlitz to Neisse. But instead of strengthening the corps of Clam Gallas, which stood opposite to Herwarth and the army of Prince Frederick Charles—instead of opposing the largest Prussian force with one equally large, he thought success would be achieved by keeping together four corps and a fifth in reserve at the mouth of the passes through which the Crown Prince would debouch into Bohemia, and contented himself with requesting the Crown Prince of Saxony, with his force of 24,000 men, to stand by Clam Gallas. This is the more extraordinary, because Prince Frederick Charles lay nearer to the point of junction, Gitschin, than the Crown Prince of Prussia—Görlitz and Bautzen being distant from Gitschin sixty miles, whilst Neisse is distant eighty miles. It is extraordinary in the highest degree when we consider that Benedek must have known that, owing to the difficulties of the road, the Crown Prince would be slower than Prince Frederick Charles. It is inexplicable unless we suppose the Austrians still to have believed in a Prussian advance into Austrian Silesia.

But whilst Benedek was thus acting so as to favour the strategy of the Prussians, let us see what the Prussians themselves were doing, and upon what grounds they based the probability of combining their forces in front of Gitschin. They knew that the smallest Austrian army lay in front of Prince Frederick Charles and General Herwarth; they were aware that the main body under Benedek would advance, or was advancing, towards the mouths of the passes which lead from Upper Silesia into Bohemia. They had a certainty that none of their movements would be kept so secret as to prevent Benedek from making quick counter-moves, especially as he had free use of the railroad from Brünn to Königgrätz, by which an immediate concentration could be effected. They had no hope of being able to surprise Benedek either at Nachod, or at Eypel, or at Trautenau. Their only chance lay in their throwing Prince Frederick Charles and General Herwarth's corps rapidly forward upon Gitschin. They might thus hope to disable Clam Gallas and the Saxons in an encounter with superior forces. Giving the broken Austrians no respite, but, by sharp and, if necessary, by forced marches, reaching the neighbourhood of the point of junction, they would disengage and lighten the advance of the Crown Prince through the dangerous passes and long defiles in which his army would have to proceed. For this reason they gave Prince Frederick

Charles the largest of the two armies on the shortest road; the Crown Prince being appointed to take the longest and most arduous route with the smallest army.

The result was contrary to all expectation. Prince Frederick Charles pursued his way with extraordinary circumspection, following the tactics of a wary general, anxious for the security of his flanks, driving the enemy quietly before him, but leaving little to chance; doing his work cleanly but too slowly for the attainment of the combined plans. Thanks to this dilatoriness, Benedek was enabled to keep four corps at the mouths of the Bohemian passes; the Crown Prince with three corps had to beat four corps of the enemy; he suffered one serious check, and his good generalship alone, aided by the energy and foresight of his staff and of General Steinmetz, saved the Prussian army from a disaster.

It is in some respects to be regretted that Lieutenant Hozier, the 'Times' correspondent, followed the march of Prince Frederick Charles instead of joining the army of the Crown Prince. The correspondence conveyed an erroneous impression as to the relative importance of the various engagements, because, in reading the picturesque yet scientific accounts given of the affairs at Liebenau, Podol, Hünerwasser, and Gitschin, we were not aware that the Prussian army of 140,000 men was fighting against only 60,000 Austrians and Saxons, the retreating and constantly diminishing corps of Clam Gallas and the Crown Prince of Saxony. But when we look down from the vantage ground afforded by fuller and more general descriptions of the war, we are surprised that the victories of Prince Frederick Charles should have been won with such loss of time. It was in the nature of the Prince to be leisurely. As one of the historians of the war has said, 'In his operations, as well as in 'battle, he was always concentrated, and moved frontwise, 'whereas the Crown Prince generally took up a broad front, 'threatening and attacking the enemy in flank, forgetting his 'own line of retreat, but looking sharply after that of his 'opponent. The method of Prince Frederick Charles is cor-'rect according to the systematic teaching of the school of 'Archduke Charles. That of the Crown Prince reminds more 'surely of the masterly enterprise of renowned captains.'*

Both the armies of Prince Frederick Charles and of the Crown Prince received their marching orders on the evening of June 19.† On the 24th, the first of these combined with

* Grenzboten, pp. 243–4.

† The following statement of the forces on both sides is absolutely

General Herwarth's corps, entered Bohemia from Rumburg and Zittau, and encamped between Reichenberg and Gabel.

---

correct as regards Prussia, and fairly correct as regards Austria. We take it from the 'Grenzboten,' pp. 208 and following:—

'The force at the disposal of the King of Prussia was as follows:—

1. Army of Pr. Fred. Charles, comprising 2nd, 3rd, and 4th army corps and cavalry; 72 battalions=72,000 men, 18 cav. reg.= 11,000 horse, 49 batteries, with 294 guns. Görlitz.

2. Elbe army of Gen. Herwarth von Bittenfeld, 8th army corps and half the 7th; 34 battalions=34,000 men, 6 cav. reg=3,900 horses, 22 batteries of 132 guns. Torgau.

3. The second army of Crown Prince of Prussia, the guards, 1st, 5th, and 6th army corps; 92 battalions=92,000 men, 20 cav. reg.=12,500 horses, 58 batteries, with 348 guns. Neisse.

4. Army of the Main, Gen. Vogel von Falkenstein, Göben's div. 7th corps, Manteuffel's Schleswig division, Gen. von Beyer's division, late garrisons of Federal places; 48 battalions=48,000 men, 5 regiments of cavalry=3,300 horses, 16 batteries, with 96 guns.

5. Silesian local corps, Gen. Count Stolberg; 9 battalions= 7,800 men, 3 cav. reg.=1,800 horse, 1 batt. of six guns. Garrisons of fortresses in addition.

6. Mülbe's reserve corps; 24 battalions=24,000 men, 6 regiment cav.=3,600 horses, and 8 batt., with 48 guns.

'The Emperor of Austria's forces were these:—

a. Army of the North:—In Bohemia, Count Clam Gallas, with his corps, the Kalik brigade, from Holstein, the Edelsheim cavalry division, and the Saxons, i.e. Austrians; 38,000 men, 1 reg. of cav., 600 horses, 88 guns; cavalry division, six cav. reg.=3,600 horses, 24 guns; Saxons, 17 batt.=17,000 men, 2 cav. reg.=1,200 horses, and 60 guns. Total, 55,000 inf., 5,400 horse, 172 guns.

b. Marshal Benedek, with six corps and four divisions of cavalry; 168 battalions=186,000 men, 28 cav. reg.=16,000 horses and 544 guns.

c. There were brought into the field, of Bavarians, 4 divisions= 40 battal. or 36,000 men, 4 cav. reg.=2,360 horses, 64 guns, 8 reg. of reserve cavalry=4,720 horses and 12 guns. Reserve artillery, 76 guns.

d. There were brought into the field, of Wurtemberg troops, 1 div.=12 batt. or 10,000 men, 14 squadrons of cav.=2,000 horses and 52 guns.

e, f. Of Baden troops; 1 div. of 11 battalions or 8,800 men, 11 squadrons of cav.=1,600 horses and 38 guns; of Hesse-Darmstadters, 9 batt.=7,000 men, 8 sq.=1,100 horses and 24 guns.

g. A brigade of Austrians, under Field-Marshal Neipperg, was composed of 7,000 infantry, 300 horses, and 16 guns; 19,000 Hanoverians, 6,000 Hessians of the Electorate, and 4,000 Nassauer need not be reckoned.

He had but to proceed in order to catch some of the outlying brigades of Clam Gallas, which lay scattered along the frontier. He preferred to rest during the whole of the 25th, and left Clam Gallas time to withdraw behind the Iser. Thus within a few hours from the commencement of hostilities, Prince Frederick Charles committed several mistakes. He gave up the chance of surprising the enemy by rapidity of action, he betrayed the direction of his line of attack, and he materially increased the difficulties of the Crown Prince. When he moved on the 26th, with Herwarth's corps against Hünerwasser, with Horn's division of the 1st army corps against Liebenau, the Austrians had so far secured their retreat that they presented none but covering troops to the enemy's blows.

Clam Gallas had taken up a position between Turnau and Münchengrätz, 'as if he could hope to defend the line of that 'river.'* He had not the means to prevent Prince Frederick Charles from bridging the Iser at Turnau (June 26), yet he resolved to defend the lower passages of a river which had already been crossed. Prince Frederick Charles, on the other hand, forgot that he was within fifteen miles of Gitschin, the point to which his instructions should have led him; and instead of leaving Clam Gallas alone, or forcing him to a flanking retreat, he determined to sweep the line of the Iser before advancing further. It was under these circumstances that the Horn division, almost turning its back on Gitschin, was led to the storming of the Iser bridge at Podol, a brilliant but not absolutely necessary feat of arms (June 26–7), and that a day (June 27) was again purposelessly spent in concentrating troops against Clam Gallas by Münchengrätz. The latter may well be proud of having held so long in check the enemy whom he could not hope to repulse. He formed his army on the evening of the 27th, in a position strong by nature, but

---

'This calculation excludes staff, engineers, military trains, and commissariat.

'In round numbers:—

Prussia disposed of 277,800 infantry, 36,100 horse, 924 guns.
Austria „ 295,000 „ 33,000 „ 982 „

'Of these there were present at the Eastern seat of war:—

Prussians, 229,800 infantry, 32,800 horse, 828 guns.
Austrians and Saxons, 241,000 infantry, 22,000 horse, 716 guns.

'At the Southern seat of war:—

Prussians, 48,000 infantry, 3,300 horse, 96 guns.
South Germans and Austrians, 68,000 infantry, 11,000 horse, and 282 guns.'

* Rüstow, p. 176.

dangerous from its liability to be outflanked, between Münchengrätz and Ober-Bautzen. Prince Frederick Charles attacked it with the whole of his combined forces on the 28th, and, admirably seconded by his troops, a detachment of which turned the plateau of the Muskyberg with extraordinary bravery in Indian file, he forced Clam Gallas to a precipitate retreat. The disproportion of the combatants may be judged from the fact that the battle of Münchengrätz only cost the Prussians 150 killed and wounded. The loss of time was more important and quite irreparable.

Clam Gallas now withdrew in haste, leaving his opponent, after his old and inveterate fashion, to detach troops as far west as Jung Bunzlau. With divided action, and contrary to his usual practice, Prince Frederick Charles now moved two army corps concentrically on Gitschin (June 29), and finally approached the point of junction, which he might have reached much sooner. General Tümpling's division of the 3rd army corps was thrown forward, on the road from Rowenskow to Libun, and General Werder's division of the 2nd army corps at right angles to Tümpling, on the road from Sobotka to Lochow. The greatest resistance was offered by the main body of the Austrians and Saxons on the heights of Kozlow, Tabor, and Prachow; but within an hour and a half, the combined effect of the Prussian attack from two sides at once and from two divisions alone, forced the enemy to withdraw, their movements being further hastened, according to Saxon accounts, by direct orders from Benedek. Ten o'clock had struck on the evening of the 29th of June as Tümpling's division straggled into the streets of Gitschin, and earned a night's rest at the point of the bayonet. On the 30th, Prince Frederick Charles effected his junction with the Crown Prince, and encamped with his whole army between Gitschin and Horitz. But far from having assisted the Crown Prince to force the passes of Silesia, as it was intended that he should do, he received no despicable aid from that very quarter, where the Prussian army had had to contend with forces vastly superior to their own.

We shall now have occasion to compare the action of the second army under the Crown Prince of Prussia with that of the first under Prince Frederick Charles; and we shall observe that where mistakes were made, they were due not to the general-in-chief, but to those under his orders. We may note at the same time that extraordinary proofs of skill and bravery were given by at least one of the corps commanders, the energetic and unbeaten Steinmetz, and that the neglect of

another to follow one of the best known rules of warfare actually turned to the profit of the combined action of the whole army.

On the evening of the 19th of June the Crown Prince of Prussia received orders from the King to leave one corps on the Neisse, to direct another (the 1st corps) westward upon Landshut, and to place the two remaining corps in such wise that they could either act with the first against the Bohemian frontier, or reinforce the position on the Neisse. On the 19th, therefore, the chief of the King's staff, Moltke, was not sure that the Austrians would not decide on invading Upper Silesia. It soon became clear, however, that Benedek had no idea of assuming the offensive, and that he was bent on concentration under the guns of Josephstadt and Königgrätz. Accordingly, the Crown Prince, who had correctly divined the enemy's plans and foresaw the necessity of crossing the mountains before they had time to combine their forces, asked leave of the King to advance westwards and to take with him the 6th corps intended hitherto for the covering of Neisse. On the 22nd of June, orders came down from Berlin to enter Bohemia in the direction of Gitschin, and on the 23rd, permission to use all available troops for that purpose. A feint was made at the last moment with the 6th corps under Mutius, south of Neisse and towards Freiwaldau, but this was soon abandoned, as the 6th corps prepared to follow the 5th under Steinmetz from Glatz towards Reinerz. Steinmetz led his corps upon Nachod as the left wing of the Crown Prince's army. Bonin, with the 1st corps, moved from the neighbourhood of Landshut upon Trautenau, and formed the extreme right with which Prince Frederick Charles's left must be felt. In the centre, and chiefly upon cross and hilly country roads, in two divisions, the guards, under the Prince of Wurtemberg, passed through Braunau, from whence they might be used as occasion required for the support of Steinmetz and Mutius on one side, or of Bonin on the other. The Crown Prince in person stood on the 26th of June at Braunau in the centre of his position, and saw the guards march by on the road to Pölitz, where they bivouacked. Simultaneously, on the right, Bonin got on from Liebau over the border as far as Goldenöls, and on the left, Steinmetz's vanguard under Löwenfeldt occupied Nachod and the heights to the east of it. A skirmish between lancers of the guard and Austrian Mexico lancers near Pölitz; a short struggle at Schlaney, on the frontier before the entrance of Löwenfeldt into Nachod, were the only incidents of that day.

It was considered remarkable at the time, and will probably continue to be so in history, that the Austrians did nothing to arrest the progress of the enemy through passes which might have been held for a long time with impunity by small detachments against a large army. The ground has been described as beyond measure impeded by natural obstacles. The main roads not only do not follow the valleys, but they cross them, forming defiles in which no troops can deploy. The villages are mostly lanes of considerable length on the sides of mountain streams. Many, nay most, parts are thickly wooded and are calculated to conceal the movements of an enemy. All these advantages were neglected by the Austrians, who thought themselves secure of victory by posting themselves at the mouths of the passes. We find accordingly Ramming, with the 6th corps at Opocno due south, Archduke Leopold with the 8th corps at Jaromierz, south-west of Nachod; while Thun-Hohenstein, with the 2nd corps, lay in reserve at Josephstadt. Against the guards, who might be supposed to debouch at Eypel, we see Festetic's 4th corps at Königinhof; and, watching Bonin's appearance at Trautenau, Gablentz's 10th corps at Arnau and Pilnikau. According to all human calculations, Steinmetz's marching columns, issuing out of the pass of Nachod, ought to have been repulsed by Ramming deployed, if not destroyed by him and Archduke Leopold united; and it was clearly in anticipation of this great peril that the army of Prince Frederick Charles was ordered rapidly to advance upon Gitschin. Fortunately for Prussia, Benedek disdained to attack with two corps, or it happened that he could not get Archduke Leopold up from Jaromierz in time; and Ramming alone led the attack against the Crown Prince's left. Still, the bravery and ability of Steinmetz had to outweigh the superior numbers of the Austrians and the delays of Prince Frederick Charles.

On the morning of the 27th Field-Marshal Ramming left Opocno with his corps and a division of heavy cavalry, partly on the Skalitz, partly on the Neustadt road, both of which converge upon Nachod. At 10 A.M. the vanguard of Löwenfeldt's division of Steinmetz's corps, advancing westward from Nachod towards Skalitz, had just issued, a few companies strong, from a deep defile at the junction of the Nachod and Neustadt roads, when it was attacked in the left flank by Ramming with two brigades. In a moment the Prussian front, meeting a withering fire of the Austrian artillery, was thrown back upon the Nachod pass. Two squadrons of dragoons ordered to stop an Austrian cuirassier regiment, were driven back like chaff. Confusion seemed to cover the advance,

and the Crown Prince himself, entangled in the whirl, was for a moment unable to extricate himself from the mass of dismounted dragoons, loose horses, infantry columns, artillery and ammunition waggons, mingling with each other in the narrow and steep pass. But the forlorn hope of dragoons, though flung back, had done service. Löwenfeldt withdrew his forward battalions step by step, deploying the remainder to his own left in the wooded ground lining the Neustadt road, and Ramming began to feel that the moment of surprise was over. Perceiving, indeed, that he was already striking upon solid masses, he ceased to press too strongly, and deployed under cover of his heavy cavalry *à-cheval* of the Nachod-Skalitz road. The Crown Prince ordered up artillery at once to his right, and in the course of the day, upwards of 80 guns were in position at one time, sweeping the ground which sinks from Wysokow downwards towards Skalitz. Here too, whilst Löwenfeldt was laying his troops out on the left, the division of General Kirchbach was pushed vigorously forwards on the right by General Steinmetz, favoured by the charges of the Crown Prince's cavalry brigade under Wnuck, which at noon had successfully cleared the field (Wenzelsberg) of Ramming's Prince William of Holstein-Glücksberg's horse. The Austrians, whose sole purpose had been, during the day, to turn the Prussians' right, were driven back step by step, until, at four o'clock, the whole of Steinmetz's corps had debouched, fighting, out of the pass of Wysokow. The object which Ramming had been ordered to attain was not effected. He retired upon Skalitz, dispirited and entirely broken, having brought into action 29 battalions, 16 squadrons, and 100 guns, against 22 battalions of Prussians, having lost 6,000 dead and wounded, 2,500 prisoners, three standards, and six guns, in comparison to which the Prussian loss of 59 officers and 1,132 privates killed and wounded is amazingly small. At Skalitz Ramming reported to Benedek that he was repulsed and could not hold his ground without assistance. Benedek sent Archduke Leopold, whose corps had come no further than Josephstadt, forwards to Skalitz, with orders to take the command of the remnant of Ramming's disordered force, and to assume the offensive from Skalitz against Steinmetz. The Crown Prince of Prussia, on his part, brought up six battalions of Mutius's corps from the rear to strengthen Steinmetz on the field.

Whilst this victory was gained on the left, disaster had been felt upon the Prussian right. General Bonin's vanguard under General Grossman, advancing on the morning of the 27th of June

from Goldenöls entered Trautenau and cleared it of the enemy after a short but sharp resistance. Advancing from thence towards the heights south of the town, it met, on a plateau, the Mondel brigade of Gablentz's corps, and there a fight began in which neither side could do more than hold its own, the Prussians endeavouring to gain a strong footing in the steep hills, at the top of which General Mondel was receiving constant reinforcements, the Austrians on their part trying to drive back the Prussians reinforced by their main body into the defile beyond Trautenau. In process of time Gablentz had pushed forward his entire force, whilst General Bonin stood in reserve behind Trautenau with 10,000 men, and even refused the offer of the 1st division of guards, which had reached Qualitsch in his rear to assist him. His strange infatuation did not long remain unpunished. The van under General Grossmann began at three o'clock in the afternoon to give way, and its retiring movement was soon necessarily followed by the division on its left; at half-past seven Gablentz was in possession of the field of battle, the Prussians in full retreat through Goldenöls, but still too strong to be pursued by the exhausted Austrians. Had Bonin been sufficiently near at hand with his reserve (10,000 men), he might have changed the fortune of the day, but all accounts agree 'that none of 'the reserves were close enough to the field to be used.' Had he kept his presence of mind, he would have brought up his army in position behind Trautenau instead of forcing it to march back to its old bivouac. But what Bonin might have really done with his still intact reserve is most obvious when we consider the lists of casualties. The Prussian loss was 63 officers and 1,360 privates killed and wounded; the Austrian was, according to the lowest computation, 3,500 killed and wounded. Had the last ten battalions of Prussians gone into action they would have found Gablentz completely exhausted, and Bonin would then have gained a victory as decisive as that of Steinmetz at Nachod.

As the Crown Prince entered the village of Hronow, where head-quarters had been prepared for the night of the 27th, he received the intelligence of General Bonin's retreat. He forthwith issued orders to the corps of guards under the Prince of Würtemberg to march through the Eypel pass and take Gablentz's right flank in rear, so as to regain possession of Trautenau, and re-establish connexion with Bonin's corps. Early in the morning he proceeded to Kosteletz to watch the double engagement known to be inevitable on that day; the engagement between the Prince of Würtemberg and Gablentz

on one side, that of Steinmetz with Archduke Leopold and Ramming on the other. To the assistance of Steinmetz the heavy brigade of cavalry guards under Prince Albert (junior) of Prussia was detached. At noon a sharp cannonade in the direction of Skalitz and of Eypel proclaimed that the battle on both sides had begun.

The guards who had left Braunau on the 26th of June had been moved in two divisions on the cross-roads between Trautenau and Nachod. Hiller von Gärtringen, with the 1st, hearing the guns of Bonin's action on the 27th, had taken the road to Trautenau, and, as we have seen, offered his services without success. He had turned southwards on receiving Bonin's answer and gone on to his bivouac at Eypel. The second division under Plonsky, at the head of which the commander of the guards Prince of Würtemberg stood, reached Hronow and Kosteletz on the 27th, as the thunder of the cannonade at Nachod was strongest. Unlike Hiller von Gärtringen, the Prince did not offer his services to Steinmetz, who was but three and a half miles distant, but remained in position expecting the approach of an enemy represented only by cavalry detachments. This was a fortunate omission. The Prince of Würtemberg might have contributed greatly to the gain of the battle of Nachod, but, had he been engaged there on the 27th, he could scarcely have co-operated at Eypel. As it was, his division had a great and glorious share in the defeat inflicted on the Austrians on the 28th.

After driving back Bonin, General Gablentz sent word to Marshal Benedek that he was much exhausted by his victory, and that he required more strength to oppose to a division of the Prussian guards at Eypel. In the night of the 27th-28th, Benedek pushed forward the Fleischhacker brigade of the Festetics corps (then lying at Königinhof) to reinforce Gablentz; and on the way, this detachment halted for rest in a bivouac between Prausnitz and Burgersdorf. Gablentz had orders to march with all the forces at his command to Prausnitz, engage any Prussian troops that might lie between Bonin and Steinmetz, and if possible make a diversion in favour of the Archduke Leopold and Ramming at Skalitz. But he was caught by the Prussian guards under the Prince of Würtemberg as he was carrying out these orders, and before he had changed his old front which was turned against Bonin for a new one. He had left the Grivichich brigade 7,000 strong in Trautenau, was himself advancing from Neu-Rognitz, and had sent on the Knebel brigade to cover what was to be his left at Staudenz. There was no lack of surprises on both

sides during the action. On the one hand the Fleischhacker brigade was attacked by the Prussians near Prausnitz, almost before it was formed; on the other, two Prussian battalions, sent up to Alt-Rognitz 'to open communications with Bonin,' were fallen upon by 7,000 men of the Grivichich brigade, ordered by Gablentz to turn the Prussian right.* Thus there were partial fights at places widely separated from each other, and the victory was won by the men of most nerve and strength, who were the Prussians. The order in which these partial fights took place was as follows: the 1st division of Prussian guards was directed against Staudenz, which the Austrian general Knebel held with 24 guns. The 2nd division of Prussian guards in reserve at Raatsch detached the two battalions northwards to Alt-Rognitz 'to try and feel for 'Bonin.' Gablentz met the enemy in the attack on Staudenz with heavy artillery, in a good position in rear of that place, checking the hostile advance with as many as 64 guns, whilst he changed his front to a new one on a semicircle from Staudenz to Prausnitz. But as he deployed his brigades one after the other, the 1st division of guards kept on advancing; flinging back resistance first upon Burgersdorf then upon Soor, until the main body of the Austrians was forced to retreat by Prausnitz upon Königinhof. The most fearful episode of the day for Gablentz was, however, that of the engagement at Alt-Rognitz. With two different objects in view, two opposing forces were marching without knowing it against each other, on the country roads between Eypel and Trautenau. The brigade of General Grivichich, 7,000 strong, was intended to surprise the Prussian right, and was on its march from Trautenau for that purpose. Two Prussian battalions of the Kaiser Franz regiment of guards were detached, we have seen for what purpose. These two disproportionate bodies met at Alt-Rognitz, and there began a struggle of extraordinary bitterness. The stand made by the Prussians was heroic. As if they felt that they must hold fast at any rate to prevent a dangerous flank attack, they clung to the ground with the tenacity of bears; and when at last the rest of the 2nd division came up from Raatsch to their assistance they were reduced to half their original numbers. Then, however, the tables were turned. The Austrians were pressed with such vigour that they fell back from position to position, leaving the road to

* This movement of two battalions to look for Bonin, who was known to have retreated to Goldenöls, seems open to the charge of rashness.

Trautenau covered with their dead and wounded, and Gablentz balanced his victory over Bonin by a defeat of far greater consequence. The Prussians, as usual, lost far less than their opponents; they had 25 officers and 809 privates *hors de combat*; the Austrians lost 4,000, besides an equal number of prisoners. No sooner was the field thus cleared for the further advance of the Prussians, than the Crown Prince sent orders to Bonin to take the road through Trautenau to Arnau, and thus gain possession of the passage of the Elbe at that point. Bonin and the Crown Prince met next day at Trautenau, each of them no doubt conscious of what they owed to each other in the successful conduct of their operations.

Gablentz, as matters went, was very far from being able to afford the Archduke Leopold and Ramming at Skalitz the assistance which was desired at his hands. On the very day and at an earlier hour even than that in which Gablentz broke ground against Prausnitz, the Archduke Leopold had formed his army corps along the banks of the Aupa and in Skalitz, and began to advance, leaving Ramming's beaten corps of the previous day in second line. The orders issued to General Steinmetz were to proceed to Gradlitz, and join the guards advancing upon Königinhof. He perceived as day broke that the enemy lay exactly in his path, and he disposed his forces so as to meet the Austrians half way. Leaving the vanguard of the 5th corps under Colonel Voigts-Rheetz in position north of Wysokow, Hoffmann's brigade of the 6th corps with General Wnuck's cavalry southward of the same point, and Kirchbach's division in rear in reserve, he threw forward General von Löwenfeldt with an infantry brigade and 24 guns on his right by the Nachod-Skalitz road. At Studnitz a high ridge called the Schäferberg overlooks the valley of the Aupa north-east of Skalitz. Here Löwenfeldt was directed to take up his position, whilst Voigts-Rheetz advanced westward supported by Hoffmann, and Kirchbach's division followed on the road from Wysokow to Kleny. The Prussians thus extended in a line due north and south from Studnitz to Kleny, the Austrians, in the same direction from Skalitz to Slic; on the extreme left of the Austrians stood a force of cavalry and artillery, which crept closer to its supports in the main body as the brigade of Prussian guards and cavalry made its appearance under Prince Albrecht at Zernow. On seeing Steinmetz take the offensive, the Archduke paused. The action began by Löwenfeldt rushing on to seize the hilly ground and wooded hummocks stretching between him and the vale of the Aupa. A heavy cannonade was opened by his batteries against those of the

enemy in position between Skalitz and Slic, whilst an equally quick and well-fed fire was kept up in the same direction by the Prussian artillery at Wysokow. From the ground gained in the first onset renewed attacks were made along the whole front, the Austrians gradually falling back on their last positions, the hills between Skalitz and Slic. To the attack of these the Prussians formed as if on parade and marched with their bands playing. A bloody and close encounter followed along the railway embankment running from Skalitz through Studnitz, at the railway station, and in the barricaded streets of Skalitz itself; and at four o'clock the Austrians were beaten completely back upon Josephstadt, leaving behind 5 guns, 5,850 prisoners, and 5,815 killed and wounded.

Having cleared the way in this solid fashion for the passage of his troops towards Gradlitz, Steinmetz bivouacked on the field and rested till the next day. It was even past noon before he broke ground on the 29th, with Kirchbach's division in front. Löwenfeldt and Hoffmann, as the main body, following General Wittich with a brigade of infantry, and a brigade of cavalry covering the left flank of the march by Kleinskalitz and Trebesow. The centre and right were ordered to cross the Aupa, near Slic, and gain the road from Chwalkowitz to Gradlitz by a circuit north of Mislowes. The enemy upon which General Wittich first struck on reaching Trebesow was the fresh corps of Marshal Festetics (the 4th), bent probably on retreat or under orders to cover Josephstadt. The march of Steinmetz to Gradlitz being impeded by the outposts of this corps, made an attack on the mainbody at Schweinschädel necessary. Wittich, who had to contend with superior numbers, was soon reinforced by Kirchbach bringing his right shoulder forward, and both together soon carried the village of Schweinschädel, from which they retired as the corps made good its passage towards the object of its march. It was dawn, however, of the 30th before Steinmetz bivouacked at Gradlitz and threw his outposts forward upon the banks of the Elbe. On his right, the concentric action of the Prussians had likewise been carried out, though not without further bloodshed. The guards had broken from Prausnitz on the morning of the 29th, and come to blows with the Fleischhacker brigade of the 4th corps in front of Königinhof. This brigade, severely handled as it had been the previous day, was covering the retreat of the 4th corps, to which it belonged. It was beaten out of the town after a series of smart street fights, which ended in the capture of two stands of colours, 400 prisoners, and the bridge on the Elbe, over which the Prince of Würtemberg instantly

threw his vanguard forward. General Bonin had in the meanwhile reached the banks of the Elbe south of Arnau, and with his outposts at Miletin, on the 30th, had opened communication in form with Prince Frederick Charles. The 6th corps, on the extreme left, had followed Steinmetz, facing Josephstadt, with pickets on the right bank of the Elbe. Rest was required by the tired troops of the Crown Prince as much as by those of Prince Frederick Charles; and rest was allowed them on the 1st, and even on the 2nd of July. The plan of a further and combined advance required maturing, and this was done under the orders of the King of Prussia, who now took the field in person.

Benedek's successive defeats, or rather the defeat of his lieutenants, having led to the concentration of the Prussian army, 230,000 strong, in front of Königgrätz and Josephstadt, it seemed a natural if not a necessary course that the Austrian army should be withdrawn to a position under the protection of some great natural or artificial obstacle, there to re-form itself, and regain the spirit and elasticity which it had lost. The most overweening confidence could not expect that soldiers, whose painful duty it had been to retire before the enemy for days and days in succession, who, in addition to being harassed by long marches, were smarting under the depressing influence of repeated repulse, should retain the ardour and stamina required for offensive movements. The manner in which the Prussian victories had been won; the experience even of the only battle which had been unfavourable to them, were calculated to spread a feeling of despondency throughout the ranks of the Austrians. They had learnt to their cost that, whether owing to the quick repetition of the Prussians' fire, or its more certain and deadly aim, the bravery of bayonet attacks had become comparatively unavailing. Wherever they had occasion to judge of their own losses in contrast with those of their enemy, they could observe that the proportion was against them in the ratio of at least three to one. We cannot believe that Benedek was blind to these obvious considerations, any more than that he should fail to convince himself of the advantages he should derive from the withdrawal of his army into Moravia. Had he preferred the less distant, though perhaps less secure, position immediately behind the Elbe, he would have presented to the King of Prussia a front protected by a river and two fortresses, which could only be forced or turned. In the first case, the Prussians would have had to mask the two fortresses, cross a broad and deep river, and perhaps carry entrenchments behind it.

In the second, their flanks would be open to successive attacks, during which they might have suffered in detail. Had Benedek possessed the overweening confidence of which we have spoken, another alternative would present itself to his mind. He had now got together the whole of his army. It was only necessary for him to take a bold offensive, and grasp his enemy at the most vulnerable point. The trial would be final and decisive. He did *not* possess confidence for this; nor do we believe he would, of his own accord, have taken any other course than that of a fresh concentration upon his rear. But as on a previous occasion, so on this, there is reason to believe that his own will was not that which he had to consult. His movements in detail could not be dictated, but it was possible to dictate whether he should assume the offensive or not. He was told to take the offensive. Accordingly, after some hesitation whether he should deploy on the right at Dubenetz, or in front along the Bistritz, he took a sort of middle course, calculated, as he hoped, to satisfy his superiors. He made one stride in advance, and then entrenched himself. The 1st and 2nd of July were taken up in these operations, which could not escape the observation of the Prussians, in so far at least as the right of their army was concerned; and thus the battle of Königgrätz became inevitable.

As the reconnoissances of Prince Frederick Charles constantly struck upon swarms of the enemy, and as the King's head-quarters were in rear of the 1st army at Gitschin, it was there that the conduct of the war was most immediately discussed. There are no more interesting details in the contemporary chronicle of the war than those connected with the deliberation as to the movement of the army on the evening of July 2nd, and the issue of orders on the same night. On the extreme left the absence of all news of the enemy had caused great disquiet to the Crown Prince of Prussia, but the contrary to Prince Frederick Charles. Whilst the latter begged the Crown Prince to help him (July 2nd) with the guards in a reconnoissance, the Crown Prince had given orders for a similar operation on his part, and instructed General Mutius for this purpose to throw out the 6th corps early in the morning towards Josephstadt. In the interval, however, new plans had been formed. The advance of the enemy to the Bistritz had been construed into an intention on his part to attack the Prussian centre at Horitz. To prevent this and deprive him of the advantages of the offensive, the King determined to throw forward his right, whilst the Crown Prince was to harass

him on his marching right flank. In furtherance of this plan the written instructions to the Crown Prince were these:—

'Head-quarters, Gitschin, July 2, 11 P. M.

'Intelligence received by the 1st army is, in substance, that the enemy, three corps strong, and likely to be reinforced, has advanced to Sadowa on the Bistritz, where an encounter with the 1st army at early morning may be expected. The 1st army will stand according to orders, at 2 A. M. of the morning of the 3rd of July, with two divisions by Horitz, one division by Milowitz, one by Cerekwitz, two by Psanek and Bristan, the cavalry corps by Gutwasser.

'Your R. H. will take the necessary measures to support the 1st army with all forces against the right flank of the expected march of the enemy, and will attack as soon as possible. The orders issued this forenoon under other circumstances are hereby withdrawn.

'(Signed) VON MOLTKE.'

To General Herwarth, whose bivouacks extended to the extreme right on a line between Smidar and Neu Bidsow, behind the river Zidlina, similar orders were despatched.

We now have a clear view of the object which the Prussians proposed to themselves to attain. They started, not with the notion of attacking an enemy in position, but with the view of meeting his attack; not with the idea that his whole force was advancing on the Bistritz, but under the impression that he was in motion with at most 90,000 men. It would have required more genius than Prince Frederick Charles possesses to discern, when he overlooked the position of Sadowa and Chlum on the morning of July 3rd, that it was dangerous to attack it before being assured of the near approach of the Crown Prince. Not three corps, but the whole Austrian army of seven corps, including the Saxons, lay entrenched in front of Königgrätz; and nothing seemed more likely, (since, according to arrangement, Prince Frederick Charles would be near enough at eight in the morning to attack, whilst the Crown Prince could only start on his fifteen miles' march at that very hour,) than that the overwhelming superiority of Benedek would drive back the 1st army before the 2nd could come to its assistance, unless Prince Frederick Charles should postpone his attack till a later hour. But Prince Frederick Charles had not been a quarter of an hour at Milowitz on the morning of the 3rd, before he began to suspect that the enemy had given up the offensive. Though he had an intercepted letter in his pocket purporting to have been written by Benedek to a subordinate, in which the Field-Marshal declared his intention to annihilate one of the Prussian corps, if possible, before the arrival of the other, he saw everything so quiet in the direction

of Dub, that he believed the Austrians had begun to retreat; and he ultimately gave orders for the passage of the Bistritz, fearing lest the retiring enemy should disappear without a battle.

It is needless to say that the Austrians had not the slightest intention of retiring. On the contrary, they were entrenched in a position dangerous in the event of a forced retreat, but of great strength in many respects. It lay at right angles to the road from Königgrätz to Horitz, on a series of undulations rising gently from the banks of the Elbe, on the east, overhanging the Bistritz more precipitously between Nechanitz and Benatek, on the west, looking down on the vale of the Trotina to the north. In rear of the outspringing positions of Sadowa and Benatek, the high hill of Chlum was strongly occupied, Benedek in person having taken his stand there with the corps of Clam Gallas and Ramming behind him in reserve, and the cavalry to the left about Problus and Prim. The Saxons kept the extreme left at Nechanitz, and the line of the Bistritz as far north as Tresowitz. Gablentz's 10th corps stood behind Dohalitz and Dohalitza. Archduke Ernst's 3rd corps at Sadowa. Festetics' 4th corps at Benatek and Cistowes. Count Thun's 2nd corps between Maslowed and Trotina.

That Prince Frederick Charles and Herwarth were able to keep Benedek engaged, and hold their ground from eight in the morning till past noon, is most honourable to the Prussian arms. The obstinacy of their courage was the cause of the Austrians' defeat. Nothing appears to have stopped the burst of their onset on the whole of the line between Dohalitza and Benatek. Dohalitza, Dohalitz, Sadowa, and Benatek were all carried by the 4th division (late Herwarth) the 3rd (Werder), the 8th (Horn), the 7th (Fransecky), whilst the 5th (Kamiensky), and 6th (Manstein), followed Horn. A check was soon felt by the 3rd and 4th divisions in their attempt to get beyond the points which they had gained in their first rush. The ground before them was open and gently ascending, the Austrians covering it with the fire of their artillery; and all efforts to effect a further advance remained for hours fruitless. Much was gained by the divisions holding their own, and ruggedly refusing to give way, whilst, however, they edged off towards the protection of the woods nearer Sadowa. But here no Austrian reinforcements being required, their spare reserves were, with all the more security, directed towards the proper left of Prince Frederick Charles. It was on this proper left that Benedek's utmost energies were for a considerable time expended. General Horn having taken Sadowa, proceeded to

try the wood behind it, and there he kept the enemy at bay with surprising energy, receiving volleys of artillery and charges of infantry with equal constancy and intrepidity. General Fransecky, after storming Benatek, had thrown his left shoulder forward in order to give a hand to Horn, whilst the latter lent him the assistance of two battalions. The flanking fire under which he withered as he thus struggled obliquely along the Austrian front was most destructive, but the Prussians here fought desperately, not only disabling the 4th corps of Festetics, but successfully beating off two-thirds of Ramming's corps thrown forward for their annihilation; and they were still actively engaged when the arrival of the Crown Prince in the afternoon freed them from the closest embrace of the enemy. As one of the best critics of this campaign has declared, it was because the Crown Prince was coming that Benedek wanted to win at this point; for this reason Benedek could only oppose the Crown Prince with a comparatively small force, throwing all the men at his disposal against Fransecky, but in vain.

We gain a striking idea of the task which lay before the army of Prince Frederick Charles, when we consider that the Crown Prince only moved out of his bivouacs, about fifteen miles away, at eight in the morning, the very hour in which Horn, Fransecky, and the others first dashed across the Bistritz. By a happy concatenation of circumstances, the orders issued to Mutius over night for a reconnoissance in force towards Josephstadt had lightened the labour of transmitting the Crown Prince's orders for the moving of his corps. The heads of columns of the 6th corps were already on their way and needed but a change of direction to co-operate with the main body. Much rain had fallen in the night. The King's aides-de-camp had not been able to transmit instructions to the Crown Prince at Königinhof before 4 A.M. The Crown Prince had not despatched his own before 5 A.M. Bonin lay eight miles away westward of Miletin—the guards at Königinhof. The 5th and 6th corps, between Gradlitz, Schurz, and Wolsdorf, had in part to effect the passage of the Elbe. It was under a steady down pour from low banks of sweeping misty cloud, in soft and oozy roads, that the columns began their march. Bonin, by Miletin and Gross Bürglitz upon Zelkowitz and Zizolowes; the guards, with the Crown Prince in person, through Choteborek and Lhota, upon Horenowes; Mutius by Welchow and Kustiran upon Racitz and Trotina, masking Josephstadt at Ober-Dolzen. Eleven o'clock had struck when the Crown Prince, riding on the hills westward of Choteborek, was met by

an aide-de-camp of General Fransecky, who described the position of the 7th division as extremely critical, and asked for a reinforcement of guns. The Crown Prince gave him at once the reserve artillery of Bonin's corps; and, in order to make an useful diversion in his favour, threw forward, at the same time, the guards from Zizolowes upon the rear of the Austrians at Horenowes and Maslowed. He had intelligence, at the same time, that Mutius was already striking upon the Austrians (of Thun's second corps) in front of the vale of the Trotina.

The moment chosen for the attack of the guards was most propitious. Benedek had already launched in succession all his available force from Horenowes and Maslowed upon Fransecky in the wood of Benatek. He had just left Chlum to look after Thun's corps and its chances as against Mutius, when the Prussian guards and part of Bonin's corps, entering like a wedge into the feeble gap now left by the Austrians between their 4th and 2nd corps, rolled them up at Horenowes, and then successively at Maslowed, Chlum, and Rosberitz. They now became engaged from more than one side at once, but chiefly with the reserve under Clam Gallas and Ramming. The recapture of Rosberitz and of Chlum was absolutely necessary for the safety of Benedek's army, and he made prodigious efforts for that purpose. But these, though successful as regards Rosberitz, were not so as regards Chlum. Mutius, pressing forward steadily, had driven the corps of Count Thun over the Elbe, and now co-operated with the guards and Bonin's first corps in so decisive a manner that a second assault of the Prussians upon Rosberitz became possible. In this assault they carried everything before them, not only repelling their own immediate opponents, but forcing the enemy who was still fighting against the army of Prince Frederick Charles to retreat. A retreat, however, across a river like the Elbe, with a victorious adversary in front and in flank, is pretty sure to end in a rout, and this the Austrians soon felt; nor is it likely that so many would have escaped, had not bad management on the part of General Hartmann left the heavy cavalry of the Crown Prince's army in rear of Bonin, and kept it too far distant from the field to be of service in completing the discomfiture of the vanquished. The cavalry of Prince Frederick Charles was in a worse position for pursuit than that of the Crown Prince under Hartmann would have been. The squadrons could make but little impression on the solid hostile masses that still held their own when pressed in rear. For the same reason, General von Herwarth, whose two divisions

under Canstein and Münster had driven back the Saxons and Austrians from Alt-Nechanitz upon Problus and Prim, was also unable to make very decided progress after he had reached a certain point; for he lay in the path of the main line of the Austrian retreat—a line which Benedek was bound to keep at all hazards.

If we judge of the importance of an encounter merely by the losses which it entails on both sides, the battle of Königgrätz was unquestionably one of the most remarkable on record. The Prussians counted upwards of 9,000 killed and wounded; they took 174 pieces of cannon, eleven standards, and 22,000 prisoners. The Austrian casualties were 16,000 killed and wounded.* Benedek is not obnoxious to just criticism for any serious blunder on the field during the day. He calculated very fairly upon being able with five corps to drive back Prince Frederick Charles, who had but three at his disposal, before the Crown Prince could come up; and the premature advance of Prince Frederick Charles doubled the Austrian chances. But during four hours of most obstinate conflict, the Prussians showed that they could stand without flinching the attacks of greatly superior numbers; and it is to this tenacity, rather than to any fault of generalship in Benedek, that the loss of the day at Königgrätz is attributable. If anything, the Field-marshal underrated the marching powers of the army of the Crown Prince. He did not believe the Prussian guards could reach the field from Königinhof at noon, any more than he believed in the possibility of Bonin's reaching the field at all from his bivouacs beyond Miletin. That these troops should have got on so fast in spite of the rain, and in spite of the roads; that they should have fought as they did at Chlum and Rosberitz, after their weary march; were feats worthy of admiration. The character of the Crown Prince as a leader of troops is shown in the steadiness of his purpose, and in the self-reliance with which he directed his army to the Austrian

* The Austrian Minister of War has just published an official list of the losses of the army during the late war. They amount, according to his account, to 71,267 men below the rank of sergeant, of which 9,671 were killed, 24,096 wounded, and 37,500 prisoners or missing. Of the above 62,497 belonged to the army of the North, and 8,770 to that of the South. The losses in the principal battles were as follows:—Hünerwasser, 26th June, 140 killed, 170 wounded, 460 prisoners; total 778. Trautenau, 27th June, 681. 1,702, and 1,205; total 3,589. Skalitz, 28th June, 2,455, 3,360, and 5,850; total 11,645. Sadowa, 3rd July, 4,220, 12,015, and 22,684; total 37,919.

rear, knowing that though he might by edging nearer to Prince Frederick Charles, ease him of some work, it was more important to help in annihilating the enemy by firmly carrying out the strategic movement.

We shall not attempt to sketch the further progress of the two armies, as the one advanced victorious into Moravia, and the other fell back upon Olmütz. It is well known how Benedek gave up the intention of fighting his way from Olmütz to Vienna, and was induced to prefer the longer and safer road across the Carpathians into Hungary. It is equally well known that the Prussians had nearly gained the passage of the Danube at Presburg, when an armistice was signed and hostilities came to an end on the Eastern battle-fields.

It may not be uninteresting before we close this article to cast a rapid glance at the most salient incidents in the short campaign which brought the Prussians south of the Main. We shall see how advantages were derived alike from the rashness of the Prussian general von Fliess and from the brilliant generalship of Vogel von Falkenstein.

It is unnecessary to dwell in detail on the movements of the Prussian corps, which pounced severally upon Cassel, Stade, and Hanover. We shall assume that these corps have done the duty to which they were detached; and follow for a space the King of Hanover in his retirement from Herrenhausen to Göttingen. Considered in a military sense only, the operations of the Hanoverian army are as curious as anything recorded in history.

The King and the Crown Prince of Hanover entered Göttingen at 4 A. M. on the 16th of June, followed by as many trusty friends and troops as they could muster. The loyal Hanoverians from all quarters flocked to the rendezvous; the contents of the Hanoverian arsenals were forwarded as fast as possible by all sorts of conveyance. Reserves were called in; horses were pressed into the service. Three days and nights were spent in organising remounts, in reforming the officers' corps, in equipping the artillery. The best chargers of the King's own stud were harnessed to guns; uniforms were got up in haste; and the men who could not be enrolled on the spot were directed to particular points on the road along which the army was to proceed. We have all heard of the daring with which Captain von der Wense entered Cassel on the 19th of June, and halted before the house of the Minister of War in order to ascertain whether the Prussians were at hand; how he got out of the town with his hussars before the advance of General von Beyer could cut him off. The same brave

officer stumbled with his men on a reconnoitring party of Rhenish Hussars (9th Reg.), on the 22nd at Witzenhausen. Wherever they went the Hanoverian patrols seemed to hit upon those of the enemy; and this, no doubt, accounts in a great measure for the hesitation with which General von Arenschildt moved after leaving Göttingen. Had the army been unencumbered, we see no valid reason why it should not have fought its way through any *cordon* which the Prussians might have drawn together to close the passages southwards. The chivalrous example of a king leading his troops in person might be flattering to the pride of the Guelph; but the monarch ought to have considered that soldiers can only be led with precision and speed by one who can overlook the path and see the goal. Armies are not to be directed with success from the seat of a carriage and four; and soldiers who have to look to the safety of a blind chief, his court, his chamberlains, secretaries, cooks, and valets, will find that these are *impedimenta* more fatal than any other. Yet in spite of all, one cannot but wonder at the tardy pace of the Hanoverians on their way from Göttingen. The King left that city on the 21st of June, a day before the arrival of the Prussians under General Goeben. On the 22nd he was at Mühlhausen, on the 23rd at Gross Gottern. His force comprised 17 battalions of infantry, 3 regiments of cavalry, and 52 guns, in all about 18,000 men; up to this point the plan seems to have been to follow the road to Fulda; now it was proposed to break out by way of Eisenach. The Prussians used all kinds of ingenious devices for convincing the Hanoverians that they were closed in. Quarter-masters sent into neighbouring villages ordered provision to be made for an imaginary army of 30,000 men. Fires on the slopes of the Thuringian hills were made to simulate the bivouac of a great encampment. Captain von Zielberg was sent on the 20th of June by Colonel von Fabeck, who had but 3,000 men at Eisenach, to summon the Hanoverians to surrender. There was nothing to prevent the latter from passing into the valley of the Werra, if they had thought fit to do so. But the King and his advisers seem to have thought that, if they did not come to the Bavarians, the Bavarians must come to them; so they sought to gain time by negotiating. They lost precious hours at this futile occupation; and when at last they broke off, taking up a defensive position at Langensalza, they were still upwards of twice as strong as any force the Prussians could muster against them.

Whilst, however, we justly criticise the want of decision and supineness of the Hanoverians, we have not much to say in

favour of the arrangements of their adversaries. On the 26th of June, General von Fliess had got together about 8,000 men, including the contingent of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg; and it was arranged that with the co-operation of General Goeben, who held Eisenach, a combined movement should be made upon Langensalza on the next day. General von Fliess accordingly marched at the appointed hour to Merxleben, engaged the enemy with great bravery, but was met in such a manner as to lame him completely. General Goeben had been detained at Eisenach by telegraphic orders from Berlin, in consequence of a false alarm telegraphed thither that the Bavarians were coming down from Coburg and Meiningen. It was now open to the King of Hanover to march upon Gotha, scatter the remnant of the enemy, and make good his retreat to the southward. He did nothing of the kind, and thus retrospectively justifies the rash and otherwise useless attack of Von Fliess.

After the capitulation of General Arentschildt which now became inevitable, 18,000 men of the best troops that Germany can boast were removed from the list of Prussia's foes, and Vogel von Falkenstein was enabled to concentrate himself for the invasion of South Germany. He began his movement from Eisenach on the 1st of July. Of his opponents the most threatening were the Bavarians, whose plans, however were materially altered by the withdrawal of the Hanoverians. All that Prince Charles of Bavaria could now strive for was to join the army which Prince Alexander of Hesse had brought together in advance of Frankfort. On the 30th of June, Prince Charles had occupied Suhl in the valley of the Werra. In his attempt to fall back from thence on Fulda, the point of junction with Prince Alexander, he met with a most humiliating discomfiture.

Vogel von Falkenstein very clearly perceived the necessity of keeping Prince Charles and Prince Alexander asunder. He had three divisions under his command. That of General Beyer, he threw forward on the Eisenach and Frankfort road towards Fulda. He marched against the Bavarians in person, with the divisions of Manteuffel and Goeben, and caught them at Dermbach, Kaltennordheim, and Hünfeld. The manner of his attack was such that Prince Charles was forced to abandon the march to Fulda, and take the road to Kissingen. Vogel now turned his columns against the Prince of Hesse, who retired from Fulda to Gelnhausen on hearing of his colleague's defeat. The object of the Prussian had been so far successful, and he had prevented the junction of his opponents. Throughout the whole of the subsequent campaign Falkenstein's tactics

were the same. He beat the Bavarians again at Kissingen and Hammelburg, the Hesse-Darmstädters at Aschaffenburg; flung in fact the isolated detachments opposed to him in a series of engagements south of the Maine. Not once did the enemy succeed in concentrating his forces so as to enable him to encounter the Prussians with superiority of numbers. When at last such a concentration became possible, the defeat of the Austrians in Bohemia and Moravia had so demoralised the whole of the adversaries of Prussia that they were induced to sue severally for peace. It might be instructive, but would require more space than we can devote to the subject, to expose in succession the mistakes and failures of the Bavarians, Hessians, Austrians, and Würtembergers on the fields where each of them fought. It is sufficient to have picked out the most startling examples to show that even in a war remarkable for the promptitude and completeness of its results, errors were committed by the conquering generals which would probably have proved fatal to their success, if they had not been counterbalanced by errors still more fatal on the side of their antagonist.

ART. IV.—1. *Sur les Corpuscules Organisés qui existent dans l'Atmosphère. Examen de la Doctrine des Générations Spontanées.* Par M. L. PASTEUR. (Annales de Chimie et de Physique, Tome LXIV. 1862.)

2. *Traité de la Génération Spontanée.* POUCHET. Paris: 1859.

3. *Rapport fait à l'Académie des Sciences sur les Expériences relatives à la Génération Spontanée.* (Annales de Chimie et de Physique, Tome IV. 1865.)

4. *Further Experiments on the Production of Organisms in Closed Vessels.* By GEORGE CHILD, M.D. (Proc. Royal Society. 1865.)

THE possibility of Spontaneous Generation, or the production of animal and vegetable life without the agency of organisms of a similar nature, has long been discussed, and is a question upon which even to this day different views are held.

The ancients most distinctly believed in the direct creation of animals from mineral sources; thus Aristotle states that whenever a moist substance becomes dry, or a dry one moist, animals are produced. In the Middle Ages, too, the same belief was held, for we find Van-Helmont describing a mode for the artificial formation of mice. Such crude opinions

could not long withstand the advancing spirit of scientific inquiry, and at the end of the seventeenth century the celebrated Italian physician, Redi, proved that the maggots in putrefying meat are the larvæ of flies, and that by completely surrounding the flesh with a fine gauze, the production of the maggots was stopped.

The introduction of the microscope, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, gave a fresh impetus to the discussions upon spontaneous generation. Some writers being unable to account for the vast numbers of new forms of animal life which were thus revealed, and seeing in these forms no traces of the modes of propagation existing in the higher species, were led to infer that these were produced, under certain favourable circumstances, from inorganic sources by some special vitalising force. Others, giving play to their imagination, fancied that they discovered amongst the singular forms of infusoria all the ordinary means of reproduction, and hence they disbelieved in the spontaneous growth of even these lowest types of animal life. Although the extension of microscopic investigation has proved decisively that this class of animals is propagated in a manner entirely different from the higher orders, still the discussion upon the question of their origin in certain cases is continued to the present day; and in spite of the immense amount of light thrown upon this interesting subject by the patient investigations of chemists and physiologists, it must be acknowledged that the question of spontaneous generation is not finally settled.

The theory of the artificial formation of the higher types of animal life has, with a few exceptions, not been supported in recent times. One of the most singular cases of delusion of this kind is that of the production of Mr. Crosse's electrical spiders, in the year 1838. This gentleman gravely described the production of a kind of 'microscopic porcupine' appearing in a vessel containing a solution of silicate of potash and a piece of stone, through which a current of electricity was passed by means of two platinum wires:—

'At the end of fourteen days I observed,' says he, 'two or three very minute specks on the surface of the stone, white, and somewhat elevated. On the eighteenth day fine filaments projected from each of these specks or nipples, and the whole figure was increased in size. On the twenty-second day each of these figures assumed a more definite form, still enlarging. On the twenty-sixth day each assumed the form of a perfect insect, standing upright on four or five bristles, which formed its tail. On the twenty-eighth day each insect moved its legs; and in a day or two afterwards detached itself from the stone and moved at will. It so happened that the apparatus was

placed fronting the south, but the window opposite was covered with a blind, and I found these little animals much disturbed when a ray of light fell on them; for, out of about fifty which made their appearance at once, at least forty-five took up their habitation on the shaded side of the stone. . . . These insects have been seen by many of my friends, and appear when magnified very like cheese mites, but from twice to eight times their size, some with six legs, and others with eight. They are covered with long bristles, and those at the tail, when highly magnified, are spiney. After they have been born some time they become amphibious, and I have seen them crawl about a dry surface.'

Mr. Crosse must have been much inconvenienced by these electrical spiders, for they became a positive pest in his laboratory, so fast did they multiply; 'in the course of time they 'increased in number, and as they successively burst into life, 'the whole table on which the apparatus stood was at last 'covered with similar insects, which hid themselves wherever 'they could find a shelter.' We need scarcely say that these insects were simply the *Acarus domesticus*, the domestic tick or mite, a well-known form of animal which inhabits localities where cleanliness is not the rule, both on land and water, 'fixing 'themselves upon various animals whose blood and humours 'they suck, and even insinuating themselves beneath the 'skin, and often multiplying prodigiously.'

The more closely we examine all these cases the more plainly do we see that it is only the most simple and minute organisms in which the mode of formation has anything of mystery attached to it, and to these bodies alone shall we, therefore, direct our attention.

The infusoria (so called from their occurrence in infusions of vegetable matter when exposed to the air) are found in enormous numbers in every stagnant pool, and form a large class of varied types of animal life; some possessing a complicated system of stomachs and digestive organs; others again being bags of jelly-like substance with an opening or mouth through which the food is taken up; whilst the simplest form of such beings as the Amœba or Proteus animalcule consists of a mass of clear jelly possessing neither stomach nor mouth. Observed under the microscope, the Amœba may be seen gradually to move its gelatinous body into various shapes, and should it come into contact with the decaying vegetable or animal matter which serves as its food, the jelly is seen to spread over and enclose the decaying particles, which then become digested as if the animal possessed a complete mouth and system of stomachs. Most of the infusoria, however, have funnel-shaped openings or mouths, and are covered by hairs or ciliæ, by the

vibration of which food is brought into the mouth and the animal is enabled to swim about. These polygastric infusoria, as Owen tells us in his Hunterian lectures, 'are the very type 'of the digestive function: assimilating and reorganising the 'decomposing particles of animal and vegetable matter with a 'hundred-stomach power. That low delight, the bliss supreme 'of the civilised gourmand, is given most liberally where it 'ought to be, to the creatures at the lowest grade of animality.' The smallest of these infusoria, and those which make their appearance first in the vegetable decoctions exposed to the air, are called *Monads;* they appear, under the microscope, usually as mobile points, possessing as a rule a diameter of about $\frac{1}{50000}$ part of an inch. Lower still in the scale of animal life come the *Vibrios;* these are jointed animalculæ, each individual consisting of a very thin filament which splits off from the parent. They possess neither head nor tail, nor do they show any trace of structure, and except that they exhibit a power of apparently voluntary ciliary locomotion they might be classed amongst the vegetable world. These creatures are always present in infusions, and are distinguished as Vibrios when existing in thin pliable filaments, as Bacteriums when the corpuscles are connected together by a thread-like more or less inflexible chain, and as Spirillums when they have a corkscrew shape and move in a spiral direction. Some idea may be formed of the difficulty of making observations respecting the structure and habits of these creatures owing to their extremely minute size, when we learn from the observations of Ehrenberg that 800,000 millions of these animalculæ may be contained in one cubic inch of water, and yet occupy but one fourth of its space.

Doubts have been expressed by some of our leading microscopists even as to the animal nature of these organisms. Certain decided forms of vegetable life are well known to possess a power of ciliary locomotion, and it is in fact still an open question whether the organisms which are classed as Monads, Vibrios, and Bacteriums do not often consist of the spores of plants. The mode of propagation and distribution of these minute creatures is thus well described by Professor Owen:—

'The act of oviparous generation—that sending forth of countless ova through the fatal laceration or dissolution of the parent's body—is most commonly observed in the well-fed Polygastria, which crowd together as their little ocean evaporates; and thus each leaves, by the last act of its life, the means of perpetuating and diffusing its species by thousands of fertile germs. When the once thickly-tenanted pool is dried up, and its bottom converted into a layer of

dust, these inconceivably minute and light ova will be raised with the dust by the first puff of wind, diffused through the atmosphere, and may there long remain suspended; forming perhaps their share of the particles which we see flickering in the sunbeam, ready to fall into any collection of water, beaten down by every summer shower into the streams or pools which receive or may be formed by such showers, and, by virtue of their tenacity of life, ready to develope themselves wherever they may find the requisite conditions for their existence.'

'The lowest forms of growth of the vegetable kingdom are the peculiar organisms which make their appearance in widely different situations, producing disastrous effects upon crops of every kind. To these microscopic fungi the botanical name of Mycelium is given; but they are more generally known by the common names of mushroom spawn, mould, rust, smut, and mildew. The material of which these several kinds of fungi are composed possesses an extraordinary amount of vitality; it may be dried and kept for years, and even heated to the boiling point of water, and still, when again exposed to moisture and to a moderate temperature, it revives and grows. The edible part of the mushroom and visible portions of the larger fungi are, in reality, only the organs of fructification of the plant. They contain the seeds, or spores, consisting of millions of the most minute particles which fall out when the plant is ripe, and are carried by the wind to far distant spots, there to form new mycelium and new spores. A beautiful natural photograph of the mushroom, or fungus, may be obtained from these sporules, as Sir John Herschel has shown, by allowing the ripe mushroom, having the stalk cut off, to lie for twelve hours upon a clean glass plate; the spores then drop out from the radiating folds of the mushroom in which they are contained, and, adhering to the surface of the glass plate in the place upon which they fall, leave a most delicate and exact tracery of the plant. The same mode of propagation is found to exist amongst all the fungi, whether microscopic or not, and of the latter class we now find no less than 2,479 distinct species enumerated in the 'Index Fungorum Britannicorum.'

It is the existence of sporules of these various species of fungi floating about in the air that gives rise to the common phenomenon of 'mould' which we observe in bread or in cheese. The sporules fall upon the moist bread, find there circumstances to suit their growth, and gradually develope into a tree-like form bearing sporules, which in their turn are dropped, float in the air, and form the origin of a new fungoid

colony. This particular fungus is termed by mycologists *Penicillium glaucum*, and it possesses characters of as specific a kind as those of the edible mushroom. The number of distinct species of moulds already recognised is very large; they are generally parasitic, and cultivated plants of all kinds, and even the bodies of animals, are more or less subject to their ravages. No less than thirty species are known to infest plants of the corn tribe, whilst ten different fungi inhabit the potato and produce the dreaded disease. The vine-disease and hop-blight, the black-rust on standing corn, and the mildew which rots cotton cloth and causes so much trouble to the merchant and manufacturer, as well as the green-mould which the epicure values on a Stilton cheese, are all produced by this fine microscopic fungoid dust which is constantly present in the air, and being of so minute a kind cannot be in any way excluded. It is rendered visible as motes in the sunbeam, and only requires to find a suitable position to sow itself and produce its kind.

In the Introduction to Cryptogamic Botany, Mr. Berkeley, our great authority on these matters, well describes these Microscopic Fungi:—

'Nothing escapes their ravages. The silk or cloth stored up in our wardrobes, the meal and sugar of our kitchens, nay, the very glass of our windows, suffer in greater or less degree. In a few cases, as in cheese, their growth is encouraged, and steps are even taken to inoculate untainted cheeses; but in other instances they are a destructive poison . . . Some of the species are developed with extreme rapidity, and a few years since, when the barrack bread was so much affected at Paris by a species of *penicillium*, a very few hours were sufficient for its development, and the mould was in active growth, almost before the bread was cold.'

A still lower form of vegetable life is found in growths termed *ferments*, of which the common yeast-plant is the most familiar example. This consists of small granules of an oblong shape, always found in liquids containing sugar and albuminous matter, and developing itself by a gradual process of budding or gemmation, by which means the single granule forms in a few days a complicated system of growth. Accompanying the growth of this vegetable a most singular chemical change occurs, for the sugar in the liquid is converted into alcohol (spirits of wine) and carbonic acid, together with small quantities of other substances. This formation of alcohol from sugar is termed the vinous fermentation. By no other known process can this change be effected, and the presence of the growing yeast-plant is absolutely necessary. That sugar is

converted into alcohol and carbonic acid only when in contact with the growing particles of yeast, is readily proved by the following simple experiment. If we place a small portion of yeast inside a drum made of brown paper, and float the drum in a dish containing a solution of sugar in water, we shall find that in time all the sugar will be converted into alcohol, but this conversion will only occur inside the drum; the sugar in solution is able to pass through the pores of the brown paper, and there comes in contact with the yeast, and the alcohol when formed can make its way back again; but the yeast-cells cannot pass through, and the carbonic acid gas is therefore all evolved from the liquid inside the drum, showing that the fermentation occurs only in presence of the yeast germs. Another chemical change, viz. the conversion of alcohol into vinegar or acetic acid, is effected by another distinct vegetable growth called the vinegar-plant, or mother of vinegar (*Mycoderma aceti*); whilst other chemical changes are, as we shall afterwards show, only carried on in presence of certain infusoria.

If a clear decoction of any vegetable matter, such as hay or tea, be made, or if any complicated organic liquid such as fresh milk or blood be taken, and these be allowed to stand at a temperature of about 70° Fah. in contact with the air in a covered or even in a closed vessel, a film is observed to form on the surface of the liquid after the lapse of a few days; and if this film be examined under the microscope, it is found to be teeming with living organisms, both vegetable and animal. Moulds of many species are present, and a drop of the liquid appears absolutely alive with vibrios and bacteriums of different sorts. It is also singular that whenever the circumstances are favourable to the growth of a particular organism, that organism is sure to make its appearance; thus if we leave sugar and water with albuminous matter and phosphates exposed to the air, the yeast-plant appears, and the vinous fermentation sets in; and no sooner is the alcohol formed than the vinegar-plant starts into life, and the spirit is turned into acetic acid. Now the question presents itself at once, where do these living beings come from? Are the seeds and eggs of these thousands of different sorts of moulds and infusoria really constantly floating about in the air, and pervading all space, and able whenever they find a suitable abiding-place to take root and flourish? Or do these lowest forms of organised beings spring into life spontaneously from the conversion, as it were, of the vital energy of the whole mass of worn-out animal or vegetable matter into the special activity of these new forms of life? It

is clear that these questions can be decided by experiment alone; *à priori* reasoning on such subjects is obviously absurd. If we can succeed, by eliminating every visible source of error, in placing these organic infusions under such circumstances that no floating spores can reach them, or that if they reach them they shall be killed; and if we then find that no formation of living beings ever takes place, we may conclude that the presence of spores is necessary for the development of life, and the supporters of spontaneous generation must declare themselves defeated. If, on the other hand, we find that when we take every conceivable precaution we are still unable to prevent the production of moulds and infusoria, we may *incline* to the spontaneous generation theory, but we must be careful not to think that the case is thus fully met. It is proverbially difficult to prove a negative, and the opponents of the theory may still say that some source for the entrance or for the existence of spores has been unconsciously left unguarded.

Hence indeed comes the whole difficulty of this difficult subject. The causes of error and failure, and therefore the danger of arriving at false conclusions, are so numerous and so difficult to eliminate successfully, that we must not wonder if in spite of all the patient, laborious, and exact investigations which many lovers of science have made upon this subject, we still find ourselves in the dark upon the fundamental points of the theory of spontaneous generation.

The experimental discussion of this matter had advanced to some extent, as early as the middle of the last century, when Needham supported a 'vegetative force' theory against Spallanzani's theory of germs. This latter savant hermetically sealed various vegetable infusions in glass globes, and then immersed them for an hour in boiling water; on allowing them to remain for some days no change was observed, and no vegetable or animal life was found to be present. Gay Lussac attributed this preservative effect to the absorption of the atmospheric oxygen contained in the globe, whilst Needham explained it by the destruction by boiling of the 'vegetative 'force' of the infusion. This mode of preserving vegetables, fruit, or meat, by boiling the fresh substances for some time and then hermetically closing the vessel, was proposed and practically employed by Appert, so long ago as the year 1760, and Gay Lussac, in reporting on the process, says, 'On peut 'se convaincre en analysant l'air des bouteilles dans lesquelles, 'les substances (bœuf, mouton, poisson, champignons, moût de 'raisin) ont eté bien conservées, qu'il ne contient plus d'oxy-'gène, et que l'absence de ce gaz est par conséquent une con-

'dition nécessaire pour la conservation des substances animales 'et végétables.' The art of preserving meat, fish, and vegetables in air-tight cases has now been carried to great perfection especially in France, and the manufacture of what are termed 'Conserves alimentaires' is an important branch of trade. Excellent summer vegetables may thus be brought to table all the year round at a very moderate price. This result is solely obtained by the exclusion of the *germs* of corruption and decay, which prey upon all perishable substances with more or less rapidity. It is not the exclusion of oxygen alone that does it. For in 1837 an experiment was made by Dr. Swann of Berlin which rendered this hypothesis of Gay Lussac untenable, inasmuch as he showed that an infusion of meat not only remained unaltered after boiling when the air was excluded, but that no change occurred even if the air were freely admitted, provided it had previously been passed through a red-hot tube. Hence it is clear that the presence of oxygen does not alone determine the formation of vegetable or animal life. The next important step in advance with regard to this subject was made by two German physicians, Drs. von Dusch and Schroeder, who in 1853 showed that the air may in certain cases be allowed free access to putrescible substance without previous heating, provided only it be filtered by passing through cotton wool. Thus extracts of meat and of malt did not undergo any change, whilst in other cases sweet milk was turned sour, and fresh meat putrefied as quickly in the filtered as in the open air. Hence the experimenters concluded that extract of meat requires something more than the oxygen of the air to start putrefaction, whilst in other cases, such as that of the curdling of milk, the presence of oxygen is sufficient to bring about the change. Concerning the causes of this difference the authors decline to express any opinion, indeed, they leave it undecided whether putrefaction is 'brought 'about by the presence of microscopic spores, or whether some 'unknown chemical substance is present in the air, and is 'capable of being destroyed by a high temperature, or detained 'by absorption on the surface of the cotton wool.'

About the same time the question of spontaneous generation attracted the special attention of the French Academy, in consequence of the communication of some researches on the subject by a distinguished naturalist of Rouen, M. Pouchet, in which he asserted that he had experimentally proved the truth of the spontaneous generation theory. The Academy, in January 1860, proposed, as one of their prizes, the solution of the following question: 'Essayer par des expériences bien

'faites, de jeter un jour nouveau sur la question des généra-
'tions spontanées;' and in the notice of the prize, the committee appointed to examine the question, consisting of the first French naturalists, add the following instructions, which well indicate the difficulties attending the subject: 'La commission demande
'des expériences précises, rigoureuses, également étudiées dans
'toutes leurs circonstances et telles, en un mot, qui'il puisse en
'être déduit quelque résultat dégagé de toute confusion née
'des expériences mêmes.'

The man who had the courage to take up this challenge, and the ability to carry out these most difficult experiments, was M. Pasteur, a chemist who had previously earned for himself a wide reputation by his original researches on some of the most interesting and difficult branches of physical chemistry. M. Pasteur's first step was to ascertain whether or not spores of microscopic fungi, as well as the eggs of infusoria really are floating continually in the air, and thus to answer the supporters of the theory of spontaneous generation, who said, 'If these things are present everywhere, show them
'to us: are they not forms well known to the microscopist?' This M. Pasteur accomplished in the following simple and ingenious fashion; he placed in a glass tube a small plug of gun-cotton of the kind which dissolves in a mixture of ether and alcohol, and thus furnishes the clear solution of collodion used by photographers. Then by the aid of an aspirator filled with water, he drew through this tube a given volume of air. The floating particles of dust were caught, at least the greater part of them, by the fibres of the cotton, and then the cotton was dissolved in the ether, the particles of dust remaining unacted upon. After standing for twenty-four hours the deposit settles to the bottom of the solution, and may be easily washed with ether, and thus freed from all the collodion. The dust is then brought on to glass slides under the microscope, and examined by the aid of re-agents which determine the character of the particles, and show whether they consist of starch granules, of bits of soot or charcoal, or whether organised corpuscles are found amongst them.

'These simple manipulations,' says Pasteur, 'enable one to prove that common air invariably contains a number of corpuscles whose form and structure show that they are organised. Their size increases from the most minute forms up to those having a diameter of $\frac{1}{2000}$ of an inch. Some are spherical, others oval. Many are altogether translucent, whilst others are opaque, with granulations inside. The borders of the translucent particles are generally well defined, and so closely resemble the spores of the commonest moulds, that the best mycologists cannot observe any difference. This is as much as can

be said, except that amongst them there occur forms which resemble globular infusoria, and are regarded as being the eggs of these small beings. But, as to affirming that this particular one is a spore, or still more that it is a spore of a definite species, or that that corpuscule is the egg of an infusoria or of such a species, I do not believe that this is possible. I am content, as far as I am concerned, to affirm that these corpuscles are evidently organised. They resemble in all points the germs of the lowest organisms, and are so different that they belong, without doubt, to a large number of species.'

With regard to the number of these floating spores M. Pasteur believes that they vary considerably, and that the well-known transparency of the air after a shower, is, to a great degree, due to these particles being carried down by the drops of rain, whilst he ascribes the opacity of fogs and hazes chiefly to the presence of these motes. In order to give an idea of the number of these suspended corpuscles Pasteur describes the result of an experiment made on the air of Paris in a quiet street, the Rue d'Ulm, in which the air was passed over a plug of gun-cotton for twenty-four hours; one drop of the liquid containing the spores exhibited under the microscope many thousands of these corpuscles, and a simple calculation shows that the total number of these present in the volume of air operated upon (about fifty cubic feet) must have been enormous. M. Pouchet, one of the chief opponents of Pasteur in this question, states that he could find no such spores in the water formed by melting freshly fallen snow, and therefore he doubts the existence of such organisms in the air. Pasteur, however, properly objects to this conclusion, inasmuch as Pouchet only examined the upper surface of the latest fallen snow, and naturally found no corpuscles, as they must all have been carried down by the first fall. The question as to the nature of these corpuscles now has to be decided. Are these bodies spores capable of germination? This question Pasteur determined experimentally by sowing the small particles thus collected from the air in certain infusions which had already been boiled, and had been shown to be incapable of undergoing change.

In order to prepare such a non-fermentible infusion, a solution of sugar in water mixed with yeast was placed in a glass flask, to the mouth of which a tube of platinum was attached; the liquid in the flask was then well boiled until all the air in the flask had been expelled by the steam. The platinum tube was next heated to redness, and the flask allowed to cool; air then entered the flask, but it had first to pass through the red-hot tube, and in its passage all the small floating organisms were

burnt and completely destroyed. The flask was then hermetically closed by fusing the glass neck, and in this state the infusion can be kept for an unlimited time without the slightest formation of vegetable or animal life, this being the result not of one, but of hundreds, of experiments of this kind.

Let us now follow the effect produced by the introduction into such an unalterable infusion of some few of the small floating particles of dust, collected as we have described from the air, upon a plug of gun-cotton. Great care must of course be taken that no particles from any other source but the one desired get into the flask; and then if, on again carefully closing the flask by melting the glass, an effect is produced after the introduction of the gun-cotton, such an effect must be caused by the spores upon its surface. What is observed? After the lapse of 24, 36, or 48 hours, or more, the appearance of organised beings is *always* noticed. 'By placing the flask 'between the eye and the light the first commencement of life 'is readily observed on account of the clear transparency of the 'liquid, which is only rendered turbid by the formation of 'infusoria. This serves as an excellent indication that the 'formation of infusoria has begun, for as they move about 'through the mass of the liquid it becomes rapidly turbid. The 'moulds are recognised by the tufts of mycelium more or less 'closely packed, and more or less of a silky appearance, 'according to the nature of the species which had been sown.' The invariable appearance of these forms from the air-dust is however not satisfactory to the careful experimentalist, unless each *real* experiment is accompanied by a *blind* one; that is, one in which every detail and every precaution is carried out in the same way as in the real experiment, but in which no air-dust is present upon the plug of gun-cotton. In none of these blind experiments did Pasteur observe the formation of any organised beings, and hence he concludes that the appearance of vegetable and animal life is altogether due to the presence of spores or eggs floating in the air. The first series of experiments made for this purpose did not, it is true, yield a satisfactory result, inasmuch as in every case organised forms made their appearance; but Pasteur was able to show most convincingly why this occurred. He had collected the air over metallic mercury, and the surface of the metal could not be freed from dust containing spores, which therefore passed up with the air into the flasks, and then burst into growth in the organic liquid. The impossibility of working with mercury without obtaining spores, explains, according to Pasteur, the following experiments adduced by M. Pouchet as being the

most convincing in favour of spontaneous generation. A glass balloon full of boiling water is inserted over mercury, and some hay which had been previously heated was then introduced, and afterwards air which had been heated to redness. Under these circumstances organisms made their appearance, and it was thought that the spores had come in with the hay which had not been sufficiently heated. M. Pouchet then heated the hay until it blackened, still the growths appeared, and 'now 'the germs were thought to be contained in the small quantity 'of common air which was added. This is, however, not the 'case; the germs came in with the mercury, for if the use of 'the mercury trough be discontinued all the experiments 'which have been properly made are sure to succeed, whilst 'those in which some error has crept in, naturally fail.' In his subsequent experiments M. Pasteur altogether avoided the danger of introducing spores by giving up the use of the mercury; and by simplifying his method as much as possible, he obtained the results already alluded to.

Amongst the numerous and varied experiments made by Pasteur one deserves special notice. He desired to ascertain whether small volumes of air from different places would all contain the same number of spores, or whether air in certain localities is free from such particles. For this purpose he placed solutions of sugar mixed with yeast in sixty flasks, each having the capacity of one pint; when the solution had boiled well for some minutes he closed the flasks hermetically. Thus prepared, the solution remained unaltered in all the flasks for many weeks. These flasks were then taken to different localities, and when the sealed-up ends of the necks were cut off by a file, the air rushed in to fill up the empty space left by the condensation of the steam. Twenty of these were opened in the country on the plain of the Jura chain, far removed from any habitation; twenty more were opened on the top of one of the highest of the Jura peaks; and the last twenty were taken up the Montanvert and opened on the Mer de Glace surrounded by the snows of Mont Blanc. The floating germs, one should think, must exist in the largest number near the surface of the earth where plants and animals abound, and must diminish in number as the higher regions of the atmosphere are approached. Such indeed was proved to be the case; for out of the twenty flasks opened on the plain eight showed signs of life, whilst only five of those opened on the top of the Jura, and only a single one of those opened on the Mer de Glace exhibited any symptoms of the formation of organised beings. An experiment of a similar kind made on

the Pyrenees by MM. Joly, Musset, and Pouchet, yielded totally different results, inasmuch as flasks prepared exactly like those of M. Pasteur, and opened on the high ground of the Maladetta, all contained organised beings. This direct contradiction of the experiments led to the appointment of a commission of the French Academy, in whose presence the two contending parties were to repeat their crucial experiments. M. Pasteur, on his side, affirmed that it is possible to collect from the atmosphere a certain volume of air which contains neither eggs nor spores, and is incapable of producing any alteration in putrescible liquids; whilst MM. Joly and Pouchet, on the other hand, agreed that if one of their flasks remained unaltered they would at once acknowledge their defeat; and they stated that from whatever locality they take a quart of air, and bring it into contact with a fermentable liquid sealed up in a flask, that liquid shall invariably become filled with a mass of living beings. This scientific tournament was appointed to come off in the presence of the judges in June 1864, and the combatants met. M. Pasteur came armed with his sixty flasks, and made his experiments before the commissioners; but his opponents were not satisfied simply to repeat this series of experiments, but wished to begin the whole investigation from the beginning; this, of course, the commission could not agree to, and M. Pouchet and his friends, therefore, retired from the contest. Pasteur's experiments were, however, continued, and out of sixty-seven flasks the liquid in no less than forty-five remained intact and unaltered, whilst in twenty-two vegetable and animal growths appeared. The report of the commission concludes as follows:—

'En resumé, les faits observés par M. Pasteur, et contestés par MM. Pouchet, Joly et Musset, sont de la plus parfaite exactitude. Des liqueurs fermentescibles peuvent rester, soit au contact de l'air confiné, soit au contact de l'air souvent renouvelé, sans s'altérer, et quand sous l'influence de ce fluide il s'y développe des organismes vivants, ce n'est pas à ses éléments gazeux qu'il faut attribuer ce développement, mais à des particules solides dont on peut le dépouiller par des moyens divers, ainsi que M. Pasteur l'avait affirmé.'

The supporters of the spontaneous theory of generation have always considered that the production of germs could only occur in organic solutions, that the albuminous matter retains a kind of remnant of vitality which enables its constituents to organise themselves under favourable circumstances of moisture and temperature when oxygen is present. Pasteur has most distinctly put an end to this view, inasmuch as he has proved that these albuminous substances can be replaced by

sugar together with crystallised mineral bodies, and still the growth of animals and vegetables commences. The albumen serves in fact simply as the food for the germs of the infusoria and moulds, and the mixture of sugar and phosphates answers the same purpose.

'Experiment has proved that the organic solutions, such as sugar and yeast, extract of malt, or milk, may be replaced by an infusion made of the following constituents—

Pure water	100·
Sugar candy	10·
Tartrate of ammonia . . .	0·2 to 0·5
Ashes of the yeast plant . .	0·1

If some of the motes floating in the air be sowed in such a solution, in presence of air which has been heated red hot, the growth of bacteriums, vibrios, and moulds is always observed. Albuminous matters, fatty substances, essential oils, and colouring matter are all formed by the aid of the elements of ammonia, phosphates, and sugar.' 'Thus, the theory respecting the spontaneous formation of the lowest type of life is deprived of one of its essential foundations.'

In spite of these, and a large number of other convincing experiments made by Pasteur, the supporters of the spontaneous theory still hold to their views, and constantly bring new experiments forward in support of their opinion. A new champion on this side of the question appeared in August last in the person of M. Donné, who is welcomed the more warmly by his colleagues because he is a deserter from the enemy's camp. 'J'ai combattu la théorie de la génération spontanée,' says he; but he continues, 'aujourd'hui, je viens fournir des 'expériences et des faits contraires, c'est à dire favorables à 'la génération spontanée des êtres les plus inférieurs.' M. Donné had, it appears, three years ago examined some eggs which had been allowed to lie for some time in their natural state exposed to the air at the ordinary temperature, so that they became rotten, and he then found that although the albumen had decomposed, and the well-known smell of bad eggs was plainly noticed, not a trace of any animal or vegetable growth was to be seen. Here then we have a strong proof of the soundness of the 'spore' theory; we have a complicated animal structure into which no germs from the air can possibly pass, and no infusoria make their appearance. Now M. Donné thought that this absence of life might be explained by there not being air enough present inside the egg, so he made a hole in each egg with a red-hot needle (so that no spores might be introduced), and allowed part of its contents to flow out; the eggs were at once placed in a large pan containing boiling

water, and then allowed to stand at the ordinary temperature for some days—

'After the lapse of ten days (he says, writing in December 1866), a microscopic examination of the drops of water taken from the surface of the pan showed the absence of all life, whilst the matter collected from the interior of the eggs, on the contrary, exhibited a multitude of vibrios in a state of great activity. Where do these animalculæ come from? They do not come from the eggs, for, if they existed in them, they would have been killed by the boiling water. They do not come from the water, which was well boiled, nor from the air, because the vessel was closed, and a microscopic examination showed no life on the surface of the water. Only the contents of the eggs having undergone decomposition, as the smell plainly indicated, teemed with infusoria.' 'The conclusion seems obvious (continues M. Donné): it is that a new arrangement of the organic molecules has taken place, an arrangement endowed with life; or, in other words, it is a case of true spontaneous generation.'

To this experiment M. Pasteur answers, in the first place—

'Why were you not satisfied with the result of your first experiment with the unbroken eggs in which you found no infusoria? Surely, if the young chick inside the egg can get air enough through the pores of the shell for its growth, there will be abundance of air to support the life of the small animalculæ.'

Then he adds—

'Where does M. Donné find in my researches that a temperature *near* that of boiling water kills every germ? Have I not published numerous precise experiments to prove the contrary? and has not M. Pouchet himself shown that certain seeds may be boiled for four hours and yet retain their vitality?' 'All these experiments, and a thousand others, have been already made by me; and it is their decisive results which have forced me to say, and now force me to repeat, that in the present state of science spontaneous generation is a chimera.'

M. Donné, nothing daunted, again comes forward to the charge; and on the 11th of last January tells us that he pierces the egg with a red-hot needle, allows a third of the contents of the eggs to flow out, then at once fills up this space with *boiling distilled* water, closes the hole with some melted wax, which adheres exactly to the surface of the egg-shell—and then, after lapse of five days, he finds hosts of agile vibrios inside the egg.

'I do not know how better to answer M. Pasteur's objections. Where do the germs of these vibrios really come from? One cannot reasonably believe that they exist in the material of the egg, for I have shown that they are never developed when the eggs are allowed to decompose naturally. Surely no one will say that they come from the boiling distilled water.'

The French naturalists have not had the whole discussion of this matter to themselves, for we find an English physician publishing experiments upon the subject. In the year 1865 Dr. Child experimented with infusions of hay and other vegetable matter, employing exactly the same method which Pasteur has adopted, but with signally different results; inasmuch as in eight cases out of thirteen, organisms appeared in spite of every 'exaggerated' precaution, and were identified not only by the author but by Dr. Lionel Beale. Dr. Child believes that the explanation of this discrepancy is easily accounted for by the fact that the magnifying power (350 diameters) employed by Pasteur was not sufficiently high, as he found that all satisfactory investigation of such objects with such a power was impossible; and that a power of from 1,500 to 1,700 diameters is necessary. This microscopic side of the question does not appear to have been considered by the commission of the Academy, nor has M. Pasteur as yet condescended to answer Dr. Child's remarks.

From all the results which have been obtained on the subject of spontaneous generation, it is clear that we must suspend our judgment in the matter until further experiment places the truth or falsity of the theory upon a satisfactory basis.

On whatever side the ultimate verdict of experiment may in the end be given, there can be no doubt that the presence of these minute forms of organisms does influence to a very enormous extent a host of changes which continually occur around us; so that whether these beings are formed spontaneously, or grow up from floating seeds and eggs, whether they in part belong to the animal world or are plants some of which are endowed with ciliary motion, their sphere of action is a very large and important one.

This is distinctly seen if we consider for a moment the great changes which animal and vegetable substances undergo after death on exposure to air, or even when buried in the earth. Fermentation, putrefaction, and decay or slow combustion, are the three phenomena by which the destruction of organic substances is effected, and the earth kept pure for the maintenance of life. The theories which chemists have invented to explain the phenomena of fermentation have been most varied and remarkable, and have led to many and somewhat acrimonious discussions. These must now all be put aside, for Pasteur has shown conclusively (and no one of his opponents for a moment doubts these results), that in all cases of fermentation, life manifesting itself in the lowest forms of organisation is one of the essential conditions. As we have already stated, the

presence of the yeast-plant is necessary for the production of alcohol from sugar, that of the vinegar-plant for the conversion of alcohol into acetic acid. Pasteur extended his examination of these curious phenomena of fermentation to the change which occurs when milk or sugar, in contact with cheese, becomes converted into lactic and butyric acids (those contained in milk and butter), to which the name of butyric fermentation is given; he finds, singularly enough, that the peculiar ferment in this case is an animal, a vibrio, and, strange to say, an animal which can live without air or free oxygen—nay, which is killed if oxygen be present.

So long ago as the year 1839 Liebig published a clever satire upon one of the theories of fermentation then in vogue, entitled the 'Mystery of the Alcoholic Fermentation Solved.' In this he describes gravely, and in the most precise and scientific language, the important discovery which he has just made, by the help of a powerful microscope, of eggs existing in the yeast-plant; how he had seen these eggs burst and give rise to small animals shaped like retorts! how the mouth, stomach, intestines, &c. of these small creatures were plainly visible, and that as soon as they were born they set to work to drink up the sugar solution, which was seen to enter the stomach to be immediately ejected in the form of acid and alcohol! Three parts by weight of yeast are capable of transforming 200 parts of sugar into alcohol; or, in other words, the excreta of each little animal amounts in eighteen hours to sixty-six times its own weight! Hence also, he says, he is able to explain what becomes of the yeast when the fermentation is finished. As soon as these little animals find that there is no more sugar left, they begin to eat up one another; and by a peculiar process, everything is digested with the exception of the eggs, which pass through the body unaltered, and thus at last fresh yeast is produced, viz. the eggs of the creature which remains the last alive! When we compare Liebig's satire in 1839 with Pasteur's facts in 1862, we may see how far 'philosophy in sport' may in truth become 'science in earnest.'

The fact that alcohol does not occur in any of the productions of nature, but can only be prepared by the peculiar processes of decay or fermentation, has latterly led to a speculation as novel as it is ingenious respecting the nature of—

> 'the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world and all our woe.'

This speculation is found in a recent translation of Klopstock's Messiah, and it is to the effect that alcohol (of which word the

last syllable, we are told, is the Arabic for 'horror,' or 'delirium 'tremens') 'was introduced by Satan into the tree of know-'ledge before our first parents partook of it, and was attended 'with the same effects which have followed its use ever since'! Nor is it only in fermentation that these organisms play so important a part, but also in putrefaction, and slow oxidation or decay, the processes by which animals and plants return to the dust from which they came. For Pasteur has shown by experiments on the milk, blood, meat, and other putrescible substances, that although a destruction of the animal matter does go on in presence of oxygen or air from which all spores and germs has been excluded, still this oxidation goes on very slowly, whilst in presence of such mycoderms and infusoria the destruction takes place with great rapidity. Hence these minute beings, nature's invisible police, are agents of combustion of extraordinary activity. Indeed, the constituents of living organisms may be regarded as being comparatively indestructible, if it were not for these smallest forms of life which are apparently without any use. 'Life would become 'impossible without them, for the restoration of that which has 'ceased to live, to the atmosphere and to the mineral kingdom, 'would be suddenly suspended.'

A very remarkable addition to our knowledge of the peculiar action of these infusoria has just been made by Dr. Erdmann of Berlin. The singular phenomenon of 'bleeding bread' has been occasionally noticed from the earliest times; thus Alexander the Great, according to the account given by Quintus Curtius, was appalled by the appearance of blood flowing from inside his soldiers' bread during the siege of Tyre in 332 B.C. His seer Aristander foresaw in the flowing of blood from the inside of the bread a favourable omen for the Macedonians, and the soldiers thus inspirited captured Tyre. From the year 1004 the phenomenon of the bleeding Host and bread, as well as the 'bewitched bloody milk,' was observed several times each century; thus it was noticed in 1264, under Urban IV., at Bolsena, not far from Civita Vecchia, and Raphael has taken this for the subject of his picture called the 'Miraculo di 'Bolsena.' In 1383, when Heinreich von Bülow destroyed the village and church of Wilsnach, drops of blood were found eight days afterwards on the Host placed on the altar. In 1510 thirty-eight Jews were burnt to ashes because 'they 'had tortured the consecrated Host until it bled.' In the year 1819 the same phenomenon was seen at Legnano, near Padua, and in consequence of the great excitement produced in the minds of the inhabitants, a Government Commission was

appointed to investigate the cause of the appearance of blood-stains on food, which about the end of August was to be seen in more than 300 houses, and the priests were forbidden to exorcise the supposed witchcraft. The same appearance was observed on the Moselle in 1824, and in 1848 the celebrated microscopist Ehrenberg had an opportunity of examining this singular phenomenon in Berlin. The conclusion which he arrived at, from the careful microscopic investigation of the red stains on bread, cheese, and potatoes, was that it is caused by small monads or vibrios, which have a red colour, and are so minute that from 46,656,000,000,000 to 884,736,000,000,000 distinct beings occupy the space of one cubic inch. In August, 1866, a piece of roast veal was handed over to Dr. Erdmann upon which a quantity of these blood-stains was found, giving the meat the appearance of having had a mixture of cherry and raspberry sauce poured over it, dried, and then partially washed off with water. In this red portion large numbers of vibrios were seen in rapid motion 'dancing like a swarm 'of gnats in the sunshine.' Dr. Erdmann next tried to innoculate these red stains on to other articles of food, and in this he was perfectly successful; after thirty-six hours the bread upon which a few particles of the red matter was placed became stained, almost throughout, of a bright crimson colour.* A microscopic examination of this bread showed that the starch granules of the bread remained uncoloured and that the formation of the red substance only occurred on the gluten or nitrogenous portion of the flour. He also showed that the disease could be communicated to many other albuminous substances—such as the white of egg, serum of blood, potatoes, &c., indeed that the contagion could be communicated without direct innoculation, as the particles floated about in the air, and all the moist bread and potatoes left exposed in the laboratory where he was carrying on his experiments became imbued with the colour. In his further investigation of the nature of the phenomenon Dr. Erdmann arrived at two most interesting conclusions: (1) the colour is not due to the vibrios themselves, which are perfectly colourless, but it is produced by them from the albuminous matter contained in the food upon which the stains appear; (2) this colouring matter can be separated from the animals which produce it, and appears to be identical in its properties with the well-known aniline colour

* Red snow has sometimes been seen to fall in some parts of the Alps. The colouring matter is also probably due to some class of animalcules of a similar complexion.

known as 'magenta' now so much in vogue. Here then we have a real manufactory of coal-tar colours from albumen by the help of small infusoria! Who knows but that as we now have plantations of cacti on which the small cochineal insect feeds which yields us carmine, so we may in time grow our magenta by the aid of these most minute vibrios!

To turn, in conclusion, to a more genial sphere of usefulness of these small organisms, we find that, according to Pasteur, the peculiar changes which different kinds of wine undergo are caused by the presence of certain specific kinds of mycoderms. Thus the acidity of the white Neuchâtel wines is due to the growth of the Mycoderma Aceti, and if this be not stopped, the wine becomes worthless. Another mycoderm, the M. Vini, also exists; and this is a most useful vegetable, for when it is added to a poor wine it gives it the peculiar bouquet of a wine of good vintage. The bitter character which Burgundy sometimes attains is also due to another peculiar mould, and the change brought about in wines which are said 'to have turned' is produced by a distinct and filiform ferment. Thus we see that wine, which is the product of a cellular vegetable (the yeast-plant) acting as a ferment, remains unaltered except in presence of other vegetable growth of the same order.

A knowledge of the part played by these sporadic particles in the spread of endemic disease, whether they be propagated through the air or by means of water, or whether they be conveyed by personal contact alone, is one of vital consequence to every one of us. Unfortunately, as yet but little progress has been made by physiologists in the investigation of the existence and laws of propagation of these disease-bearing sporules.

The knowledge which we have lately obtained, chiefly by Pasteur's labours, of the phenomena of fermentation and decay, lead us to hope that before long an insight may, by patient research, be gained into the still mysterious and complicated phenomena of contagion and infection.

ART. V.—1. *Some Account of the Life and Works of Hans Holbein, Painter, of Augsburg.* By RALPH NICHOLSON WORNUM, Keeper and Secretary of the National Gallery. 8vo. London: 1867.

2. *Holbein und seine Zeit.* Von Dr. ALFRED WOLTMANN. Erster Theil. 8vo. Leipzig: 1866.

'A SPECIAL predilection for portraits is an old peculiarity of 'English taste. The fine portrait-painters of the Con-'tinent were, in times gone by, engaged in London. It was 'here that in two succeeding centuries Holbein and Vandyck, 'who, together with Velasquez, are considered the greatest 'masters that ever existed in portrait-painting—achieved their 'universal fame. At a later period, when the development of 'an independent style in art had already commenced in 'England, many of the most celebrated artists, such as 'Gainsborough and Sir Joshua Reynolds, chiefly excelled in 'portrait-painting. In some respects this peculiarity may be 'considered to denote a narrowness in English taste. But on 'the other hand it may be viewed as the natural result of that 'accurate estimation of personal worth, of that perfect acknow-'ledgment of the individual independence of man, which 'forms so important a trait in the character of the English 'nation.'

These are the words of the author of the second work which stands at the head of the present article, and they occur in a very instructive essay by him on the National Portrait Exhibition of last year.* We accept them as a courteous commentary on our national taste by an accomplished foreigner, but we cannot say that we think them true; at any rate they do not tell the whole truth. No doubt the pleasure which we derive from the portraits of celebrated men is based on our appreciation of individual worth, and there is a special satisfaction in realising in our own minds the outward form of those whose charms, or deeds, or writings have made them famous in our history. On his first visit to Venice, Göthe exclaims, 'Thank God! Venice is no longer to me an empty 'sound.' So it is with history, when we bear in our memory the form and features of those who acted in the scenes recorded by it. Without these forms and features it seems to be an empty sound. Substance and reality are imparted to every narrative of a chronicle or memoir by our belief that we know

* Fortnightly Review, No. xxxii. p. 151.

what the kings and queens and those around them looked like. There is a great charm too in attempting to trace the character of the man, or account for the influence of the woman, by the look or attitude which they assume in their portraits. For these among many reasons it is that a National Portrait Gallery, such as has now been established on the suggestion of Lord Stanhope and under the intelligent guardianship of Mr. Scharf, will become some day or another of the utmost value. But the great predominance of portrait in English art is owing, we fear, to feelings of a far more ordinary or vulgar stamp than those to which we have alluded. If we admit as laudable the natural desire which leads every one to procure a likeness of those he loves or esteems, we must also recognise the widespread influence of a feeling such as was ridiculed with some success in the 'Spruggins Family' —a feeling of vulgar self-importance centred in a man's own family and kindred, however obscure and unknown they may be to the world at large. The character of art and the nature of its productions is regulated by the public demand. Artists paint to live before they live to paint. If the mass of educated Englishmen were for many generations incapable of recognising the highest beauty in art, those who supplied works of art necessarily turned their exertions into the channel which insured them the most rapid and secure remuneration. The mass of the world were ignorant; the patronage of the ignorant could be obtained by portrait-painting, and thus it was that portrait-painting for so long a time absorbed the energies of many of our best masters.

The result however has no doubt been that in portraits the English school has been eminently successful. Some of the works of Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney may vie with the best portraits by Italian, Flemish, Dutch, and German masters of any time. Independently of the beauty of form and colour, and all the vigorous excellence which characterises a first-rate portrait, they have sometimes succeeded in embodying a spirit and feeling of a representative character. Take for instance Sir Joshua's portrait of Lord Heathfield or one of Gainsborough's pictures of a Captain (or Admiral) Hervey at Ickworth, and we find in them more than a portrait of an individual admirably conceived and transferred to the canvas; they seem to embody in a visible form the chivalrous and stedfast bearing of a gallant soldier, or the reckless gallantry of the English navy. They are types of a class as well as portraits of the men whose forms they hand down to posterity.

No question is more curious in art than the extreme rarity

of first-rate portraits. To copy what is before him would seem for the artist a mechanical task when compared with that which is required for the conception and execution of a large historical work: yet what is there which tests the real excellence of a painter more than a portrait? The advances made in the technical appliances of art do not seem to make much difference. Good portraits are still the exception, not the rule; and the power to see and feel clearly what is to be executed still remains, as it ever was, the first condition for the successful completion of such a work—but we shall have occasion to return to this question.

We may perhaps say, that the first efforts in portrait-painting in modern art are to be found in the likenesses of Dante, Brunetto Latini, and Corso Donato in the Chapel of the Palazzo del Podestá at Florence. When Giotto turned to nature as the true source of inspiration, and abandoned the conventional trammels of the old Christian mythology, the craving for individuality made itself felt; and we see its continued action in the frescoes of Masaccio and the subsequent productions of the Florentine school. In the Netherlands the true spirit of portrait appeared in the Van Eycks, but neither in earlier nor in later times did it ever shine with a clearer and a brighter light than in the productions of the great German master whose life forms the subject of the books we are now reviewing. His simple, straightforward treatment places the man before us as he lived and moved. There is, as it were, no medium through which he is seen, and there are in general no prominent accessories to distract attention from the person himself, as he looks out upon us, it may be, from against a plain green or grey ground. The artist conceived the subject which he had to paint in the clearest and most transparent manner, and then worked out this conception on the panel with sober, honest vigour, and with a power of colour and execution which has never been surpassed. No two men can be more unlike in their touch and mode of painting than Holbein with his careful and smooth handling, and Velasquez with all his dash and impasto, but they have both this quality of appearing, at least so far as we can judge, to place the person painted in the actual presence of those who look at the picture. It must not be forgotten too that in his great cartoon of Henry VIII. from Hardwick, to which we shall afterwards allude, Holbein has exhibited on a large scale a force and grandeur in no wise inferior even to the great Spanish master himself.

Foreign painters had visited England before Holbein's

arrival here, but his coming really marks our first contact with the great and illustrious masters on the continent of Europe. The caprices of expiring Gothic as it showed itself in the Flamboyant and Burgundian styles of architecture, and the quaint angular folds of drapery or twists of limb of the early German painters, were banished from his works, and superseded by the study of nature and by a style of ornament resembling very closely that of the North Italian schools. In this peculiar style Holbein excelled as an architect, and as an ornamental designer in every kind of work. He was the special representative of the principle and spirit of the Rénaissance. We often talk of 'Rénaissance' as if the word denoted one and the same character of architecture or ornament in all countries, but in reality the products of this revival of classical art in different lands differ each from the other, as much as the several languages which sprung from the Latin differ. The cases are indeed somewhat analogous. French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal, Walloon, all show their origin, but each tongue has its distinct character, and each has modified the parent Latin on a principle more or less peculiar to itself. As has been said of them

——'facies non omnibus una,
Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum.'

So it is with the architecture and decoration of the Rénaissance. The style of Cellini in Italy, of Jean Goujon in France, the work in the Certosa of Pavia, the 'plateresque' ornament of Juan de Arfe or Berruguete in Spain, and that of Holbein at Basle, all visibly flows from the revival of ancient models, but they all palpably vary one from the other. Unfortunately for us, they are for the most part superior in beauty and grace to the picturesque modifications of classical types which meet us in the style adopted in this country in the later years of Elizabeth and the times of James I.*

Holbein's peculiar character of ornament is nearly allied to that of the early painters of Padua, Mantua, and Venice, as exhibited in the fanciful decoration of many of their pictures. When contrasted with the Gothic spirit of his

* We are well aware of the fact that a portion of the time covered by 'Rénaissance' architecture on the Continent was still occupied by late or Tudor Gothic in England, and in some cases the two styles ran into each other in a very curious form; as, for instance, in the house at Sutton, near Guildford, we have windows of a Gothic type with Rénaissance ornaments in terra-cotta on the mullions and string-courses.

German forerunners and contemporaries, he appears thoroughly imbued with a modern spirit. Augsburg, the place of his birth, was the city which breathed that spirit in its strongest form. Commerce and banking, based on a free intercourse with Venice and Italy generally, prospered within its walls. Accordingly Dr. Woltmann, whose book is of a more comprehensive character than that of Mr. Wornum, devotes between twenty and thirty pages to the history of Augsburg, and we must say that we do not regret this detention on the road. The subject is one of great interest in itself, and when we have read what he says of it, we certainly feel that we know better than we should otherwise do the spirit that animated Hans Holbein, and the atmosphere in which he was brought up. On the other hand, it is only just to Mr. Wornum to observe, that in his preface he especially disclaims for his book the title of 'a life of Holbein.' 'I feel,' he says, 'that 'we have not as yet materials sufficient to justify such a 'title.'

It is probable that Holbein and another of the principal artists whom the city of Augsburg produced were connected by marriage, and that Holbein's mother was the sister of Hans Burgkmair, the daughter of Thomas Burgkmair, himself a painter of an earlier generation. Five artists at least are found in the family of Holbein; that is to say, Hans Holbein the elder, his brother Sigismund, and the three children of Hans, Ambrosius, Bruno, and the younger Hans, the subject of these biographies. Not satisfied, however, with these, Passavant in 1846 started a sixth—Hans Holbein the grandfather. The conviction of Dr. Woltmann is that there was no such person. His name occurs neither in the records of the painters' guild at Augsburg, nor on the tax-books of the city, but his existence rests substantially on the authenticity of a picture in the style of Schongauer which is now in the museum there, and on a supposed extract from the accounts of the Convent of St. Catherine. The inscription on this picture is Hans Holbein, C. A., 1459. The letters C. A. are presumed to mean 'Civis Augustanus,' and the date is certainly too early for any work of Hans Holbein the elder, the father of our painter. It had been thought that another picture at Augsburg, representing the Basilica of Sta. Maria Maggiore, and bearing the date of 1499, was the late work of the same grandfather who had executed the Virgin and Child in 1459, forty years before. But on a reference to the original extracts from the accounts, it is found that the name of the painter does not, as Passavant had assumed, occur in them at all. The result of the whole controversy is that

in Dr. Woltmann's opinion the inscription on the picture of 1459 is either a forgery or the date has been altered, and that there is no proof whatever of the existence of the earlier painter; in short, as Mr. Wornum says, 'Passavant's entire 'case for the existence of the grandfather Holbein must be 'considered as fallen to pieces' (p. 52). Yet with a curious inconsistency, Mr. Wornum seems to think that there was, or may have been, a Hans Holbein, the brother of our Holbein's father, of whom we can see no trace, and he still speaks of 'Hans Holbein, the *second* of the name, born in Augsburg 'probably in 1459 or 1460' (p. 54). We attribute this apparent confusion to the late date at which Dr. Woltmann's book came into Mr. Wornum's hands. The absence from the tax-books of the city of the name of any Hans Holbein earlier than the great painter's father, is a strong negative fact, and we agree with Dr. Woltmann's conclusion that the name of his grandfather was probably Michael, not Hans.

The son of this Michael was born about 1460, and was one of a family of five children. His pictures show traces of the school of Martin Schongauer. The earliest work of his pencil known to us is supposed to be a Madonna in the 'Moritz Capelle' at Nuremberg, which apparently bears the date of 1492; and there are three other pictures of his in the Augsburg Gallery. His name occurs in the Augsburg register of taxes in 1495, as 'Hans Holbain,' residing in the same house with 'Thomas Burgkmair,' whose daughter he is said to have married. Although we are bound to notice, in passing, the various members of Holbein's family, our proper business is with Hans Holbein the younger, and we have not space to allow of our discussing the various pictures ascribed to the father; but it is important to observe that his partial emancipation from the conventional style of the earlier German masters, probably enabled the son to start from a more advanced point than he would otherwise have reached at so early an age.

Sigismund Holbein, the only brother of Hans the elder whom we know of, is named in the tax-books of Augsburg in the year 1505, and his will is registered at Bern in 1540, in which he bequeaths to his nephew Hans his property in that city, and to his sisters his property in Augsburg. There is at Nuremberg a signed picture of Sigismund Holbein; at Vienna two portraits, of which Mr. Wornum speaks highly, are attributed to him; and a head in our own National Gallery, presented by Her Majesty in 1863, has been conjectured to be

his work.* In the Berlin collection there is a drawing of him by his nephew, which probably served as the basis of Sandrart's engraved head.

We may as well here speak of the two brothers of Hans Holbein the younger, Ambrose and Bruno. They are not mentioned in their uncle's will, and they may have died before 1540. Ambrose was older than Hans, and, according to Mr. Wornum's view, was probably his half-brother only. There is at Berlin an interesting drawing of which Dr. Woltmann makes great use in determining the age of the younger Holbein. It was formerly supposed to represent the painter himself and his father, but it is now, we think, clear that it represents Hans, by whom it is executed, and his brother Ambrose. The former is of the age of fourteen, and Dr. Woltmann reads the age of Ambrose as twenty-five, and the date as 1509. We must admit that in the facsimile or photograph given in his book the figures are sufficiently enigmatical. The words over the head of Ambrose, which were read as 'pr. (pater) ejus,' turn out to be a portion of the mutilated name 'Amprosii.' If the age is really twenty-five, he must have been eleven years senior to his brother. The Museum at Basle possesses four pictures attributed to Ambrose Holbein, who was enrolled in the painters' guild there in 1517, but these pictures were purchased only in 1661. Another picture, in the Belvedere at Vienna, is also ascribed to him. Of Bruno Holbein little is known, and we are not aware of any picture which bears his name.

For the sake of clearness then we will repeat—if we substitute Michael Holbein for the hypothetical grandfather, we have the following members of the family:—

1. Michael Holbein.
2. Hans Holbein, the father; the husband probably of Anna Burgkmair.
3. Sigismund Holbein, the brother of the last.
4. Ambrose Holbein.
5. Hans Holbein the younger, the great painter.
6. Bruno Holbein.

According to the latest researches, Hans Holbein the younger was born in 1494 or 1495. His life divides itself very conveniently into two parts—before and after his visit to England in 1526. At that time we may assume him to have been

* This portrait was in the Wallerstein collection, and was presented to the Gallery by Her Majesty in fulfilment of the wishes of Prince Albert.

thirty-one years of age. His first known work, the drawing of himself and Ambrose, already referred to, was executed in 1509, the year in which Henry VIII. ascended the throne. Holbein died, as we now know, in 1543; so that he came to this country exactly seventeen years after the commencement of his career as an artist, and exactly seventeen years before his decease.

Now, looking at the two works before us, we find that Mr. Wornum's book covers the whole of the painter's career, but of that of Dr. Woltmann, 'Holbein and his Times,' the first part only is unfortunately as yet published, and he brings us down, therefore, only to the time of the artist's first visit to England. In accordance with its title, it enters, as we have said, on a variety of subjects connected only collaterally with Holbein, although of the greatest value in appreciating his real position as the first great modern painter of Germany. If Dr. Woltmann is more diffuse, he is also more methodical and more precise, than Mr. Wornum; and the latter speaks of his book as 'an admirable work, though it is quite 'German in its view and treatment.' This is true, but it is true by way of praise. Dr. Woltmann's book is certainly distinguished by the wider views, the accuracy of research, and the unsparing labour which always make us, when we wish to investigate any subject, ask, in the first place, what German book has been published in relation to it. The English author however, though confining himself within a somewhat narrower range than Dr. Woltmann, has some extraneous matter of his own. He has interspersed in his volume certain bursts of ardent Protestantism, which are no doubt sincere, but which might, we venture to think, have been spared in a work the whole interest of which is connected with art. He tells us, for instance, that 'This year (1517) is memorable as that in which 'John Tetzel commenced the public sale of the gross and 'infamous indulgences of His Holiness Leo X.; granting for a 'few pence wholesale remission of sins past, present, and future, 'however heinous their nature' (p. 106). In speaking of the picture at Lisbon, he says there are 'no priests, no church 'dignitaries, no dogmatizers, no monks with their bald crowns, 'shaven in the pride of ostentatious humility' (p. 119). At page 123, after describing the pictures in the Council House at Basle, the subject of one of which was the severe justice of Zaleucus, he remarks, 'The terrible punishment for adultery 'imposed by Zaleucus contrasts singularly with the slight 'penances and the small fines exacted by the Roman priests 'for the same crimes, in Holbein's time, in this country.'

Again: 'In this year (1637) Henry VIII. ordered the Bible 'to be translated into English, and in the following year it was 'set up in the churches; a blessing we seem to owe indirectly to 'the king's irascible opponents, those two old bishops of Rome, 'Giulio de Medici and Alessandro Farnese' (p. 289). The above are only a few among such passages. We have the greatest possible respect for Mr. Wornum's judgment in pictures, and we are grateful to him for the care and zeal which he has bestowed on Holbein's 'Life and Works;' but we think it injudicious to scatter through his pages these little zealous fragments of theological opinion, having no express or necessary connexion with the main subject of his work. When we read his book we perfectly understand now that there must be minds to which the 'conscience clause' of the Board of Education is exceedingly oppressive—minds which cannot resist the temptation to jerk out, *à propos* to any subject, the expression of a strong conviction in matters of doctrine. We hope however that books on art may, as a general rule, be kept free from these excrescences, which are offensive to some readers and must be irrelevant in the eyes of all.

In the absence as yet of the second part of Dr. Woltmann's book, we are thankful for the contribution to the 'Fortnightly Review' (No. xxxii.), with his name attached to it, containing, in a condensed form, his observations on the National Portrait Exhibition of last year. It enables us to anticipate in some degree his more deliberate judgment on one or two questions of the very greatest interest with reference to Holbein's works in this country. It would be unjust however to hold Dr. Woltmann in all cases irretrievably committed by views expressed thus hastily whilst the Exhibition was in progress, and we shall still look with anxiety for the information and for the opinions to be given after full consideration in his second volume.

We must now return to Hans Holbein the younger; and we shall endeavour shortly to sketch his career up to the time of his first visit to England, availing ourselves of the assistance both of Dr. Woltmann and Mr. Wornum. Van Mander, who is the earliest biographer of Holbein, assumes that he was born in 1498 at Basle, though he says that some persons thought that Augsburg was his birthplace. The fact that he was born in 1495 rests, as we have said, partly on the dates in the sketch of himself and his brother Ambrose, and partly on an inscription on certain pictures at Augsburg painted by him for Veronica Welser, the prioress of the convent of St. Catherine. One of these bears the date 1512, and another

a portion of Holbein's name with 'æt. suæ xvii.' Formerly the year 1512 was considered as too early a date for our painter, and these works were attributed to his father, but they are now believed to be executed by the son, though even seventeen is an early age for the production of such paintings. Mr. Wornum says of one of these pictures:—

'The figures appear to have been first drawn carefully with a strong outline, in brown, showing hatched or lined shadows; they have then been thinly scumbled over, and modelled in detail with a brownish flesh tint and white lights. The drawing and modelling are in parts masterly, and everywhere simple: the whole picture is admirable, though there is no real transparency of colouring in it, such as is found in several of the Basle examples of Holbein's early work. Much of the prominence of the preliminary drawing may be owing to the darkening of the colour through time. There is certainly a good deal of the taste of his uncle Hans Burgkmair in this series, as is evident from a comparison of the works of the two painters hanging almost in juxtaposition here, but the influence was transitory; the nephew's works at Basle leave the uncle's far behind.' (P. 89.)

The next picture, bearing the date of 1512, which we must notice, is one of some interest, inasmuch as it is to be found at Hampton Court, and has generally been supposed to represent the father and mother of the painter. Dr. Waagen, in his 'Treasures of Art,' apparently assumes it to be genuine, and remarks, 'We likewise find in it, especially in the woman, his 'peculiar lively conception, the yellowish-brown tone of the 'flesh of his earliest pictures, and the still indifferent hands' (vol. ii. p. 362). Mr. Wornum says:—

'This very precious little picture was brought from Germany by Sir Harry Vane, and belonged to Charles I.' And he goes on to observe—'Even in this work, notwithstanding the evident ability it displays, there is no striking promise of the power that was developed even only three or four years later. . . . In transparency of colour this picture is superior to that at Augsburg, especially in the carnations, and in the eyes of the mother. It has been somewhat rubbed, and the hands have especially suffered—but only one of either figure is seen.' (P. 90.)

On the other hand, Dr. Woltmann, in a note at p. 155 of his book, comments on Waagen's remarks, observing that the alleged weakness in the hands makes him suspicious; but he cautiously reserves his judgment on the picture till he shall have seen it himself. Accordingly he did see it, and in the article in the 'Fortnightly Review' to which we have already referred he gives his opinion very decidedly:—*

* Fortnightly Review, No. xxxii. pp. 136, 137.

'A picture,' he says, 'dated 1512, said to have been painted 'by Holbein, of his parents, is a very interesting one, and the 'production, I think, of a Holbein; but certainly not of 'Hans Holbein, the son, but of Hans Holbein the father. 'The whole conception and technical treatment shows this 'very clearly, especially the landscape, which, even in the 'smallest details, corresponds with the treatment of the land-'scape in the "Basilica of St. Paul," in the Augsburg Gallery, 'the principal work of that artist. The drawing of the hands, 'which is rather weak, affords another proof. It is true the 'picture has been somewhat injured by cleaning, but that the 'drawing of them was originally defective is easily discernible. 'Such is never the case in the works of Holbein the son, not 'even in his very earliest productions.'

We as Reviewers in speaking on the merits or authenticity of a picture—not a book—must say, 'Non nostrûm inter vos 'tantas componere lites.'

We will not dwell on another early picture of some interest, which bears Holbein's name, and probably belongs to the year 1512 or 1513. It represents a Virgin and Child with a little bunch of lilies of the valley beside her, and is the property of a Catholic priest, Herr Schmitter-Hug, at Ragaz in Switzerland. Count Lankronski at Vienna has a portrait of an unknown person of the same style and character which is dated 1513. The portrait of Franz von Taxis at Corsham was executed in the following year, 1514; and 1515 is inscribed on a portrait in the Darmstadt Gallery, respecting which Mr. Wornum evidently has grave doubts. He says:—

'It has much of the force and accuracy, but not the freedom, of some of the earlier portraits of Holbein, even of a later date than this; and the characteristic brown carnation of these earlier pictures is wanting. . . . It is possibly by Holbein, but conveys the impression of being somewhat too delicately executed for him for so early a date as 1515.' (P. 92.)

Dr. Woltmann admits that this work has been retouched, but thinks it worthy of the master. It was purchased through Professor Oppenheim from the patrician family of Schinz in Zürich.

The picture in the possession of Herr von Stetten at Augsburg must be placed somewhat earlier than the last portrait. It seems to be a sort of votive painting or pictorial monument in memory of Ulrich Schwartz, a man who rose from the people, and headed the popular party against the Patricians of the city. In 1477 he was chosen burgomaster for the sixth time, and caused two of his political opponents to be executed.

In 1478 Schwartz was again elected, but the Emperor's authority was called in by the other parties, and Schwartz was arrested, put to the rack, and executed.

'In this picture,' says Dr. Woltmann, 'the same feeling and the same artistic spirit are shown as in the kneeling family of the Burgomaster Meyer and the Madonna. This alone is sufficient to show that not Holbein the father, as has been said in Paul von Stetten's history, and is still maintained in Augsburg, but Holbein the son, is its painter.' (S. 159.)

Judging from Dr. Woltmann's description of this work there is none of greater interest, but unfortunately we have not the advantage of our English author's observations on it, for when he was in Augsburg in 1865 its owner was abroad, and the picture was locked up.

Just as the last painting has been attributed to Holbein the father, so has the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian in the Pinakothek at Munich been supposed to be the work of the older master. It is now admitted by Dr. Woltmann and Mr. Wornum to be executed by the son, not later than 1516, for in that year he removed to Basle: neither of them however could find in the picture the date which Passavant professed to have seen there. They do not agree in their estimate of the skill displayed in the execution of the principal figures. Dr. Woltmann says:—

'The slender form of the saint is marked by well-understood forms—truth in the foreshortening, and grace in its lines; the utmost that can be said is, that the legs are perhaps a little weak as compared with the beauty of the upper part of the body. This is an echo of the father's style, and does not go far enough to mar the effect; at any rate, it shows astonishing progress as compared with his works. I believe one may boldly say that this is the finest naked figure that German art produced up to this time.' (Ss. 166–7.)

On the other hand, Mr. Wornum observes:—

'The composition of the centre piece, the death of St. Sebastian, is dramatic and impressive as a whole, but the execution in detail is coarse and careless; the naked figure of the saint, though in a fine attitude, is ill-drawn, especially about the neck, and badly modelled, the fingers and nails particularly so; and these are parts which Holbein afterwards greatly excelled in painting.' (P. 97.)

We would be the last to dispute the value of a practised eye or of professional judgments, but when connoisseurs differ on such precise points of detail, mere amateurs may find some comfort for the mistakes they sometimes make.

The year 1516, that of the accession of Charles to the throne of Castile, closes the career of Holbein the younger in Augsburg.

We know that he did not remove to Basle until after the middle of the summer, because in the Berlin 'Sketch-book' there is a portrait of the wife of Ulrich Fugger of Augsburg, who was not married until May 23, 1516, whilst pictures of his dated in the same year were executed in Basle. The artist was at this time twenty-one years of age. The account given by Sandrart is that old Holbein transferred his residence to Basle, and entered his son as one of the painters' guild there and as his own pupil. The records of that society are not in a state to give positive evidence, but there is no mention in any document of more than one Hans Holbein in Basle, and that one is decidedly the son. In short, Dr. Woltmann rejects altogether the story of the removal of the father to Basle. Sandrart is not a trustworthy authority, and there is no proof whatever of the fact. Mr. Wornum however gives it up reluctantly, though he defends it feebly :—

'Though there is no document to prove the removal or journey of the father, it is a possible and even a probable incident; and the absence of any positive proof is not a proof of the contrary conclusion.' (P. 44.)

It seems likely that the young painter settled at Basle because it was a city enjoying great freedom in its connexion with the Swiss cantons, and was at this time one of the most literary places in Europe. The presses of Froben and Oporinus employed not only editors but also artists for woodcuts, and for head and tailpieces. The world has never seen the man who was more competent than Holbein to design these minor productions of art. We have a title-page of 1517 drawn by Ambrose Holbein, and another of the previous year with the name of his younger brother. It is probable that in such cases they made the drawings, and that the cutting on the wood was the work of others. There is also in the Basle Museum a schoolmaster's sign ascribed to Holbein, which was painted in this year. It is described by Mr. Wornum as possessing no value as a work of art, but it shows how the profession of the artist and the trade of the painter at this time ran into each other. When we read of this we are reminded of the trick played by Harlow painting the sign of the Queen's Head at Epsom to pay his bill, and signing it with the initials of Sir Thomas Lawrence.

'The artist little thought,' says Dr. Woltmann, 'when he painted it that the city of Basle would preserve it for centuries in their gallery, among the other memorials of his art and his renown.' (S. 202.)

In the same year he executed the portraits of Jakob Meyer

'zum Hasen,' Burgomaster of the city, and Anna Tschekapürlin his wife. This is the man for whom he afterwards painted the glorious picture of the 'Meyer Madonna,' of which we shall have to speak. Old copies of these portraits, and the drawings for them made with a silver point, are also preserved, and on the latter the colours to be used in finishing the pictures are carefully noted, showing that the artist probably did not finish the picture from the sitter. Mr. Wornum says that they have much of the character of his best Augsburg works, but are of a somewhat richer brown and more transparent. Mr. Thomas Baring's portrait of Hans Herbster, the father of Oporinus the printer, belongs to this same time, and is a very striking picture. The Adam and Eve at Basle, of the year 1517, ought also to be mentioned. The two full-length portraits of Conrad Rehling and his wife in the Pinakothek at Munich, with the date 1517, are rejected both by Dr. Woltmann and Mr. Wornum.

Our artist does not seem to have settled down at Basle in the first instance, but for a year or two at least he wandered about in Switzerland. He is mentioned in the books of the brotherhood of St. Luke at Lucern as having given a florin to their funds, but there is no date to the entry. Most unfortunately a house which he painted there inside and outside for Jakob von Hertenstein no longer exists; it was pulled down only in the year 1824, and nothing but a fragment of the original work still remains.

We cannot think that Woltmann has any sure ground for assuming that Holbein at this period of his career visited Italy. Our oldest authority, Carl Van Mander, expressly says that he never was in that country, and whilst we admit the evidence of Italian influence in his works, we do not feel justified in supposing that a journey thither was necessary to account for this effect, or that such journey would have been wholly unrecorded by tradition. It is possible that the influence of Leonardo may occasionally be traced in his works, and it is certain that his style of decoration and treatment often recalls Mantegna and the masters of Lombardy, but this is scarcely sufficient to warrant Dr. Woltmann's conclusion, in the face of Van Mander's positive statement.

On July 3, 1520, our painter became a citizen of Basle, where he had resided since the autumn of the previous year. On September 23 he was enrolled in the painters' guild in that city. The wings of an altar-piece now in the Cathedral of Freiburg in the Brisgau were probably executed at Basle in 1519, for one of the family of Oberriedt, and it is conjectured

that they were carried off to Freiburg in consequence of the riots of the 'Bildersturm.' They have gone through a good deal, for they were hidden at Schaffhausen during the Thirty Years' War, afterwards taken to Munich, carried off by the French in 1796, and restored again in 1808. The subjects are the Birth of Christ and the Adoration of the Kings; and the former is remarkable, because in it, as in an earlier picture of Hans Baldung Grien, and in the more celebrated work of Correggio, the light is made to proceed from the child—a feature suggested, as Dr. Woltmann tells us, by the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy of Christ.

The year 1519 was the year of Charles V.'s accession to the throne of the empire, and to it belong one or two of Holbein's most important works. Boniface Amerbach was the friend and legatee of Erasmus, and the friend and patron of the artist. He was the son of a celebrated printer at Reutlingen, who had settled in Basle; and it is to Boniface's taste and liberality that we owe the collection which forms the basis of the museum of that city.

'The most beautiful work in it,' says Mr. Wornum, 'though not the most important, but certainly one of the most admirable of all Holbein's paintings, is Amerbach's own portrait, a bust somewhat under the natural size, on a blue ground, the face, seen little more than in profile, turned to his right, the right eye being just visible. He has a slouching cap on, with a small cross on it, a furred cloak and embroidered vest, and is looking intently before him; he has a ruddy, short full beard, and the blue eyes are brilliant and piercing. The complexion is of a rich transparent brown tint, and the whole is modelled with the minute accuracy of a photograph.' . . . 'This head, I believe, the painter has never surpassed; his art as a portrait-painter perhaps here culminates in technical execution, especially as regards transparency.' (*Wornum*, p. 114.)

Nor does Woltmann's judgment as to the excellence of this portrait at all fall short of the praise bestowed on it by the English critic. It is signed, and dated 1519. The same date, with the painter's name, is inscribed on another remarkable picture which neither Dr. Woltmann nor Mr. Wornum has seen, but which was once in England. It was taken to Portugal by Catherine of Braganza, the widow of Charles II., and is to be seen at Lisbon in the Royal Palace. The subject is called the 'Fountain of Life,' and if Count Raczynski is to be believed, it has not been injured by restoration.

An evil destiny seems to have attended on all Holbein's large historical works. The Hertenstein house was pulled down, and in the same manner the great frescoes in the hall of the Rath-

haus at Basle have disappeared. Judging from the drawings of the 'Rehoboam' and the 'Saul and Samuel,' they must have been very fine compositions. The records of the city show the dates of the several payments made to the artist at successive times in the years 1521 and 1522, but the third wall of the room was not painted till 1530, after his return from his first visit to England.

Dr. Woltmann, in his eleventh chapter, discusses the merits of the eight scenes of the passion of our Lord, which are preserved in the museum at Basle. He admits that they are harsh and peculiar in their effect of colour, and that they were in some way restored by a painter of the name of Grooth in 1771. Waagen refers to them as specially showing Holbein's relation to his father, but Rumohr denied their genuineness. We may have overlooked the notice of this work in Mr. Wornum's book, but we do not recollect that he mentions it or expresses any opinion as to its value.

At Basle is to be found the 'exquisite' portrait in body colour of the painter himself, which is engraved as a frontispiece to Mr. Wornum's volume. The portrait of Froben in the same collection is said to be an old copy. There is also a Dead Christ, dated 1521, a portrait of Erasmus, and one of his wife and children, probably executed in 1525 or 1526, although Waagen, from the grey tone of the shadows, assigns it to a later time. The wife, who was probably a widow of the name of Schmid when he married her, is certainly not attractive in appearance. Whether it is true that her temper drove him to England, and what was his conduct towards her, are questions which we cannot undertake to investigate. Mr. Wornum has a natural inclination to rescue the memory of Holbein from all reproaches, just as Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle have thought it incumbent on them to undertake a very hard task in vindicating the moral character of Filippo Lippi. We may as well mention here the two portraits of one and the same lady in the Basle Museum, which Rumohr and Mr. Wornum believe not to be the work of Holbein, but which Dr. Woltmann, relying on their technical excellence and on the authority of the Amerbach Catalogue, maintains to be by his hand. One of these bears the date 1526, with the words 'Lais Corinthiaca.' Waagen traces in their execution the influence of the Flemish school, whilst our English author says that they have a decidedly Milanese character. We will suggest to the latter that the words 'eine Offenbürgin,' which are applied to them in the Amerbach Catalogue, cannot mean, as he appears to think they may, 'a native of Offenburg;'—the proper word

for that would be 'Offenbürgerinn.' It is undoubtedly the family name.

We have one more great work of our painter which demands full consideration before we proceed to that portion of his life which embraces his career in this country — we mean the 'Meyer Madonna'—a picture on which his fame in his own country at the present day rests more than on any other, and one which is remarkable in every way:—

'A German,' says Dr. Woltmann, 'when he hears the name of Holbein, thinks of his Madonna at Dresden, as he thinks on the Madonna di San Sisto in the same collection, when he hears the name of Raphael. Nay, the connexion of the name with a particular picture is in the case of Holbein still more intimate, inasmuch as the knowledge which his own countrymen have of him is almost entirely limited to this one work.' (S. 317.)

It is undoubtedly a singular fact in the history of art, if the one great work on which a painter's reputation in his own country has rested for centuries should turn out to be a copy; yet something very like this appears to be the conclusion at which we must arrive in the present case. We think that Mr. Wornum adopts this view in a form more unqualified than that in which it is accepted by Dr. Woltmann. We are disposed, on a review of the arguments, to agree rather with the latter than the former; but we must again entreat our readers to recollect that we are criticising the books—not the pictures—one of which, at any rate, we never saw. In many other instances, it is observed, that we have lost the original work of Holbein, and must be content with copies; in this we seem to have two originals competing each with the other. The picture in the gallery at Dresden is known to all who have been in that city. The one of a similar subject at Darmstadt was purchased of Mons. Delahante, a picture-dealer in Paris, by Prince William of Prussia in 1822 for 2,800 dollars, and was presented by him to his daughter the Princess of Hesse-Darmstadt.

In order to do justice to Dr. Woltmann, we must lay before our readers a translation from his comparison of these two great works:—

'What he' (Dr. Zahn) 'has said is decisive on the question. He has *proved* that which Kugler and Waagen stated as a *conjecture*—that the Darmstadt picture is the original one. When I stood before it for the first time, I knew what these celebrated judges had said, and I therefore came to the spot with certain expectations; but notwithstanding this fact, I was thoroughly surprised by the impression made on me. I came fresh from Basle, and I found in this picture the most complete agreement, both as a whole and in detail, with the best of the pictures in that city—which is far from being the case in the

same degree with the Dresden picture. At the same time, it seemed to me that the Darmstadt picture was somewhat the larger of the two. Zahn has proved that this impression is nothing but a mistake of the eye, and that the deception is owing to the proportions of the architecture. The figures are of the same size in both pictures; in the later of the two they are evidently made on a tracing from the earlier one, but in other respects all the dimensions of the Darmstadt picture are less than those of the Dresden one. The corbels in the former are much heavier and more massy than in the latter, and they project close over the heads of the persons kneeling below. This goes so far that on the right the head-dress of one of the women cuts the corbel, whilst in the Dresden picture the columns, on which the corbels rest, are visible for about the length of a head above the figures. In the Darmstadt picture the spring of the arch of the niche begins on a level with the Virgin's shoulders, and ends just close to her crown; whilst at Dresden it does not begin till it reaches the line of her chin, and there is a large vacant space between her head and the top of the arch. By these well-considered improvements all the proportions are more free and more pleasing to the eye.

'But the figures themselves also are in the Dresden picture in some places less compressed. This is especially the case with the Burgomaster, whose figure is more erect. In the Darmstadt painting he bows himself lower, so that his folded hands are only partially visible on the neck of the youth below him. The sweep of the figure of the Virgin too is somewhat changed at Dresden. In the Darmstadt picture the outline of her body to the right is more convex, and projects more decidedly—a relic without doubt of Gothic feeling, as we see it also in the wings of the organ at Basle. This peculiarity is wanting in the later picture.

'It is precisely the two principal figures in the two pictures which differ essentially in expression. At Darmstadt there is no trace of that pensive expression in the Child which has given rise to such singular explanations; on the contrary, he is smiling. The Virgin herself is wholly different. Holbein's peculiar ideal is visible in both heads, but each shows that the artist proceeded to work from a certain individual model, which was in each case different. We miss in the Darmstadt picture that vision which has stamped itself on every German heart as the highest and purest type of German womanhood—a vision of the utmost brightness and beauty, hardly showing the line of eyebrow, with its charming half-closed lids, its fine pose of the neck, and its dimple on the chin—full of inexpressible gentleness and feeling. On the other hand, we have here features altogether of a more marked type, especially as regards the larger nose and the eyebrows, which are darker and stronger. The expression too differs in the same way, and is sterner and higher in its character. I cannot however at once, like Zahn, give so decided a preference to the Dresden Madonna. The wonderful elevation of feeling in the one is almost as beautiful and quite as much warranted by the subject as the enchanting and expressive loveliness of the other. On the other hand, the Darmstadt picture is visibly superior in all the heads of the

lower group. Whoever has seen it, finds all the faces of the Dresden picture lifeless and hard in comparison. It is here for the first time that we learn to recognise the force of conviction and the thoroughness of faith which inspire the Burgomaster; here for the first time we are able to reconcile ourselves to the somewhat plain features of the young maiden who kneels in front; for in the Dresden picture there is something repulsive in them, whilst in that at Darmstadt they are actually transfigured by the glow of devotion which is shed over them. The mother, too, by her side, and the brother opposite, have far more life in the Darmstadt picture. It is with the heads in this last alone that the three coloured sketches, drawn from life, preserved in the museum at Basle, agree completely in their sharpness and refinement of feeling; and this applies to the three heads—father, mother, and daughter.' (*Woltmann*, ss. 317–19.)

On the other hand, Mr. Wornum says, speaking of the Dresden picture:—

'Under any circumstances it appears to me to be a copy, not a repetition or replica by Holbein himself; there are parts in it that Holbein can scarcely have painted. The differences in the two are great—in expression, in colouring, and in execution; there is much more character in the heads of the Virgin and of the Child in her arms, and indeed in all the heads of the Darmstadt picture; its colouring is browner, and the details are everywhere more pronounced, especially in the head-dress of the daughter, and in the carpet; in fact it has the ordinary superiority of an original by a great master, over a copy by an inferior painter; the weakest part of the Dresden example being the head and neck of the Madonna, and the expression of the Child in her arms.' (P. 166.)

But if we understand Dr. Woltmann rightly, the Madonna of the Dresden picture is precisely the figure which he thinks Holbein executed himself, whilst he sought to soften its expression and alter its type. He considers it likely that the artist made his repetition of the picture at a later date—between 1529 and 1531 or 1532—before his second visit to England. The grey tone of the shadows rather confirms this conjecture; and it is by no means improbable that the artist may, at this later period, have left more to be completed by his pupils than he did in the original work.

'Each picture has its peculiar beauties and advantages. It is true that in that of Dresden the proportions are the better for being more slender, and that the Virgin's face, entirely altered as it is, may be, I will not say more beautiful, but more charming. The artist, too, may appear at a more advanced stage of his progress; but yet in the end the prize undoubtedly belongs to the work at Darmstadt. Of *two* originals this is "*the original*," which shows the master's hand throughout, and exhibits all the freshness of a first production. For this reason it is the only one which possesses that complete unity and

that complete charm of colour which make it the brightest example of German art now remaining to us.' (*Woltmann*, s. 323.)

It is impossible to reconcile entirely the views of the two authors before us, but the conclusions of Dr. Woltmann may be thus summed up, and with them, so far as we are able to judge, we are disposed to agree:—

1st. Neither picture is a copy, properly so called, by another hand. The variations are too great to admit of this supposition, and no mere copyist would have ventured to make them.

2nd. The Dresden picture is the later of the two; and in it Holbein's own work is visible principally, if not entirely, in the Madonna and Child, whilst the group below was left to a pupil.

3rd. The Darmstadt picture alone is executed entirely by the artist himself.

The external evidence, so far as it goes, is perhaps somewhat in favour of the originality of the Dresden picture. It was bought through Algarotti in 1743 from the family Delfino in Venice. They got it from a banker of the name of Avogadro, who took it from the family of Lössert in lieu of a debt of two thousand sequins. Now we are told that John Lössert had purchased it from Le Blon, a collector, who acted as the agent of the queen-mother Mary de' Medici, and that Le Blon had bought it in the seventeenth century from the widow or representatives of Iselin, into whose hands it passed from Remigius Fesch. Fesch's third wife was a daughter of Anna Meyer, one of the persons depicted in the work itself.

But there are difficulties in this account which Mr. Wornum has pointed out. If Le Blon bought it for the queen-mother of France, as it is said he did, it might after her death be more likely to turn up in Paris than at Venice or Amsterdam. Mr. Wornum therefore conjectures that the Dresden picture may have been a copy made for John Lössert or for Le Blon himself. But then we must ask what artist could have made such a copy? To this question Mr. Wornum answers that a certain Giovanni Lodi, who was a good artist, copied two of the figures, and *may* have copied the whole picture. Allowing however that Lodi was capable of doing this, is it likely he would have altered the original composition, and even the expression of the principal figures? We think not. Dr. Woltmann, on the other hand, considers it probable that the later (Dresden) picture was a 'replica' which belonged to the Meyer family, and descended in the female line; whilst the earlier original, the Darmstadt picture, remained with the Meyers, and was taken from Basle when the heads of the Catholic party, to

which they belonged, were driven into exile by the Reformers. Its subsequent fate remains unaccounted for.

There is one point in connexion with this celebrated work in which we decidedly concur with Dr. Woltmann. Tieck was, we believe, the first person who suggested that the child in the Virgin's arms is not our Lord, but a sick child of the family whom she has taken up, whilst Christ Himself stands below. Mr. Ruskin has referred to this interpretation as 'a received tradition,' but if it were such, not even his authority would induce us to accept it. In the first place, when the Virgin stands before us with a child in her arms, the burthen of proof is decidedly on those who assume that child to be other than Christ. In the second place, there is a sentimental character about the whole theory which seems to us essentially modern, and wholly alien from the time and feeling of Holbein.

Before we enter on the consideration of Holbein's career in England, it will not be improper to make a few remarks on the gross abuse of his name, both abroad and in this country, but more especially in the latter.

> 'One of the great misfortunes in art criticism is that the reputations of secondary painters are so often absorbed by first-class names, to the certain injury of both.' (*Wornum*, p. 32.)

This observation is exceedingly true. If an amateur indeed possesses an old picture for which he wants to find a name, and shows it to a dealer, he will probably be told it is by the *second* master in the style to which it belongs; but if the same picture finds itself in the hands of that dealer, it is more likely to come out as the production of the *first*. When a picture by tradition bears the name of a second-rate artist, there is great reason to receive such tradition as authentic, because there was little temptation to falsify the name. Thus Dr. Waagen was probably wrong when he transferred to Holbein Lord Bute's Henry VIII., which is ascribed to Luke Hornebolt. We have a very high respect for Dr. Waagen's critical knowledge, but the readiness with which a name is sometimes found for pictures has led, we are told, to the currency of a very irreverent joke at Berlin. A travelling Englishman is said to have asked a German friend in that city what the great granite basin in front of the Picture Gallery was intended for, when he received the answer—'Oh! it is there the pictures are baptised!'

Mr. Wornum says no man except Philip Wouverman ever had proportionally so many works of other men ascribed to

him, and Dr. Woltmann, in his paper on the National Portrait Exhibition, tells us:—

'Of every nine so called Holbein pictures in the Exhibition, 'there is, on an average, but one original. This proportion 'may be admitted for England in general, but in some places 'it is still less. On this occasion, it may be observed, that of 'the twenty-seven pictures bearing the name of Holbein in the 'collection at Hampton Court, only *two* can be considered 'originals, namely, the portrait of Reskemeer (Reskymer), a 'gentleman from Cornwall, and the likeness of Lady Vaux, 'which, on account of its being very much painted over, is 'scarcely admissible.' (*Fortnightly Review*, No. xxxii. p. 186.)

Of course the author just quoted does not include among the Holbeins the portraits of his parents, on which, as we have seen, he differs from Mr. Wornum; and he treats the heads of Erasmus and Froben as 'very inferior copies.' Again he says —'None of the painted portraits of the King in the Exhibition 'is an original by Holbein; and up to this time I have never 'seen a genuine work by Holbein among the numerous por- 'traits painted in oil of Henry VIII.' He does full justice, of course, to the magnificent cartoon belonging to the Duke of Devonshire. The picture of Edward VI. (No. 172), from Windsor, is possibly by William Street; and the Princess Elizabeth (No. 247), at the age of fifteen or sixteen, must have been painted after Holbein's death, and is unlike his style. But we are in some degree trenching on ground which we shall have to go over again, and we must return to our narrative.

It was in the autumn of 1526 that Holbein first visited England; and having been introduced by Erasmus to Sir Thomas More, was received by him at Chelsea. This visit lasted till the year 1529; and it is probable that in the course of it he resided much in Sir Thomas's house. At any rate, during this period he seems to have painted principally such persons as belonged to the intimate circle of his patron or were among his friends.

If we begin with the portraits of Sir Thomas More himself, Mr. Henry Huth's picture first claims our attention. It was certainly one of the first portraits painted by Holbein in this country, and bears the date 1527. It was purchased from the late Mr. Farrer, and may compete in beauty with the finest works of the same class by the great Italian masters. The best of the heads of Archbishop Warham at Lambeth, and the picture of him in the Louvre, are either both originals or one is a very fine copy of the other; and the study for the head at

Windsor is pronounced by Dr. Woltmann to be the finest of all the drawings there. Both the pictures are dated, and have the age of the archbishop inscribed on them. Mr. Wornum seems on the whole to prefer the example at Lambeth to that in Paris.

The Queen's portrait of Linacre is, according to Mr. Wornum, more like the work of Quintin Matsys. At any rate, Linacre died in 1524, before Holbein's visit to England, and this picture is dated 1527. The same year is inscribed on the genuine portrait by Sir Henry Guildford (No. 149). We will just observe in passing that Mr. Wornum styles him 'Sir Henry 'Guildford, Bart.,' thus anticipating by about a century the existence of that title.

Dr. Woltmann, as we have seen, mentions the portrait of Reskymer,* the Cornish gentleman, as one of the two genuine Holbeins at Hampton Court. There is a drawing of it at Windsor; and it was one of the artist's earliest works in this country. Mr. Wornum, however, says of it, 'it is possibly a 'copy.'

The large picture of More and his family exhibited last year at South Kensington (No. 163) is without doubt 'a copy, and 'a very indifferent one too.' Seven heads belonging to this picture are among the drawings at Windsor, and the Museum at Basle possesses the original sketch for the whole. This last is all by Holbein's own hand that yet remains of it. The complete work itself has disappeared.

In the year 1529 Holbein returned to Basle, which was at that time agitated by the fiercest religious discord. There he completed the paintings in the Rath-Haus; and it appears that he was absent from England more than two years, having come back

---

* It is curious to inquire who Reskymer, thus immortalised as a very young man by Holbein, was. The family was a very old one in Cornwall. The place so called is in the parish of St. Mawgan in Meneage. Roger de Reskymer was employed in France in the 15th of Edward III. John Reskymer, who was sheriff for Cornwall in the 27th of Henry VIII., married, in 1508, Alice, the daughter of John Densill, serjeant-at-law, and the young man painted by Holbein was possibly their son, afterwards Sir John Reskymer. We doubt, however, whether the head in the Windsor drawing is not too old for a child of this marriage. He married one of the co-heiresses of the great family of Carminow (now extinct), well known for their contest with the Scropes with reference to their armorial bearings. The son of Sir John Reskymer married a St. Aubyn, and the male line became extinct, as they had only four daughters. One of these co-heiresses married a Trelawny, and another a Vyvyan of Trelowarren.

hither in 1531. We have no pictures of his which bear the date of this last year upon them; and immediately after his return his countrymen, the German merchants of the Steelyard, appear to have been his principal patrons. For them he executed, somewhere about 1532, two large 'tempera' works of an allegorical character representing 'Wealth,' and 'Poverty,' which have long since perished. Portraits of individual merchants belonging to the Steelyard are found with the dates of 1532 and 1533; and the finest of all them is said by Dr. Woltmann to be that of George Gyzen, painted in the former year, now in the Museum at Berlin. Others are at Vienna, at Brunswick, and at Windsor. Mr. Wornum almost seems to doubt the authenticity of the picture of Gyzen, which came from the Solly collection; at least he says 'there were certainly other 'painters living at the time who were also quite capable of 'producing such a work' (p. 260).

One of the most important of Holbein's works in this country is the large picture at Longford Castle, belonging to the year 1533, though Dr. Woltmann prefers to it the large portrait of Christina, Duchess of Milan, at Arundel, which he calls the best production of the artist he has seen in England. The one at Longford is supposed to represent Sir Thomas Wyatt and one of his friends. The following inscription has now been found painted on it, 'Joannes Holbein, pingebat, 1533,' and it is thus described by Mr. Wornum:—

'The faces of this picture are somewhat hard, but finely drawn; Sir Thomas's beard is well made out, with a few very fine lines; the hands are rather formal, and are not perfectly modelled; there is a hardness throughout in the painting of the accessories, but the execution is generally very perfect, though much of it must have been left to assistants, for the amount of labour bestowed upon this picture is prodigious. Some of the details, as for instance the books, are exceedingly elaborate. Sir Thomas Wyatt's magnificent dress is admirably painted, and this figure has altogether a very grand and imposing effect. Unfortunately, the picture is covered in many parts with a dirty spoilt varnish, which requires to be removed to restore it to its proper effect; it was doubtless once a brilliant picture. There are two sketches of Sir Thomas among the Windsor drawings. Holbein was distinguished for a portrait of Sir Thomas Wyatt, probably the above-described picture; for, in some funeral lines on a poet who died in 1541 aged only thirty-eight, Leland, in a small quarto printed in London in 1542, entitled *Nœniæ in mortem Thomæ Viati Equitis incomparabilis, Joanne Lelando Antiquario autore*, Holbein is spoken of as the greatest in his art, for some such work.' (*Wornum*, p. 277.)

The portraits of Derick Born at Windsor, of Henry VIII.'s

falconer, Robert Cheeseman at the Hague, and of a certain Geryck Tybis at Vienna, belong to the same year. The first of these three appears, by the address on a letter in his hand, to have been a merchant of the Steelyard. No one of the four miniatures of Henry VIII. in the possession of the Queen can be allowed to be executed by Holbein; and our data for ascertaining the genuineness of this class of works are exceedingly scanty. After 1533 the artist seems rarely to have dated his pictures; and no known work can be assigned to the two following years, unless it be a picture of Henry Brandon belonging to Her Majesty.

The Countess of Caledon's portrait of Cromwell Earl of Essex (No. 126, Portrait Exhibition), though a genuine picture, has been much injured and partly repainted. Captain Ridgway possesses another of the same statesman. A picture of another of the Steelyard merchants, dated 1536, is to be found at Petworth, and the admirable portrait of Sir Richard Southwell at Florence, belongs to the same year. Among the undated pictures none is more conspicuous than the glorious half-length of Mr. Thomas Morett, jeweller to Henry VIII., at Dresden, long ascribed to Leonardo da Vinci, and which has been called Sir Thomas More, Lodovico il Moro, Count Moretta, and Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk. This portrait was in the collection of the Duke of Modena, and was thence transferred in 1746 to Dresden. Rumohr, we believe, was the first critic who asserted Holbein's claim to the work; and the engraving of Hollar, together with the original drawing, purchased from the Saxon Government after Mr. Woodburn's sale, establish the accuracy of his judgment. The late King of Saxony, it is said, objected to the change of name in the catalogue of the gallery, because then it would possess no Leonardo!

We have no record of any payment made to Holbein as one of the King's servants until Lady Day 1538, being a payment for the preceding quarter; so that he was employed by the King in 1537, the year in which he painted the large picture at Whitehall representing Henry with a figure of his father and the two Queens Elizabeth of York and Jane Seymour. The painting was destroyed by a fire at Whitehall in 1697; but a little copy by Van Leemputt, executed for Charles II. in 1667, was in the exhibition last year at South Kensington. If we have lost the original picture, we fortunately yet possess the cartoon by Holbein's hand for the figures of the two kings; and Dr. Woltmann is quite justified in saying that it was one of the most important pieces in the whole Exhibition. It is

executed with a brush in distemper in black and white—not in chalk—and the outline has been pricked all over for the purpose of defining the outline for the fresco. There is a vigour in the conception of the subject and a force in the execution which brings Henry personally before us.

There is something very instructive in the reality belonging to works such as this and the drawings of Holbein at Windsor. Why are they more true to nature, and why do they call up in our minds the notion of life and intellect more vividly than all the elaborated wrinkles of Denner, or the hard though skilful portraits of such a man as Pompeo Battoni? There is nothing of illusion about the rough surface and coarse lines scratched on brown paper, with the high lights dashed on in body-colour or white chalk. The true power of art is suggestive rather than imitative. There must be in the eye of the artist the power to see what is essential, and in his hand the power to trace such lines as call up afresh in the spectator the image which he saw. If, indeed, he has these gifts, the more he finishes the better; his work will not lose its reality: if he has not these gifts, then no elaboration of details, no mechanical adherence to outward form or colour, and no technical 'bravura' will supply their place. This is perhaps the true answer to the question why good portrait-painters are so rare.

It is not likely that Holbein often painted the King. This great work was the type of most of his likenesses, and no other of those likenesses in the South Kensington Exhibition can be safely pronounced to have been executed by the great painter. The little picture of the Duchess Christina of Milan, Princess of Denmark, which was exhibited at Kensington, appeared to us very charming, but neither Dr. Woltmann nor Mr. Wornum seems to think it worthy of the master. We have already seen in what terms the former author speaks of the large picture of the same lady at Arundel Castle.

The first payment, as we have said, which appears in the books of the royal household as made to Holbein was a quarter's salary, at 30*l.* per annum, at Lady Day 1538. At Midsummer he received a year's salary in advance, probably because he went abroad. In the autumn he was at Basle, and in December he received 10*l.* for his expenses abroad on the King's account, and 10*l.*, apparently by way of a gratuity. A document has been discovered giving him fresh leave of absence for two years from Basle, and settling on him, if he returns at the expiration of this time, a pension of fifty florins on behalf of the city. This license or agreement is dated the 16th of October 1538. At that time Erasmus was dead, and Amerbach was the only one of

his former friends still living. The painter never returned to Basle. We know by a letter written in 1545 that Holbein's son Philip had been placed by his father as an apprentice with Jakob David, a goldsmith in Paris, and it is not unlikely that this arrangement was made by his father during his absence on the Continent in the previous year.

In 1539 Holbein presented the King with a portrait of Prince Edward as a new-year's gift, and Dr. Woltmann believes that this picture is the one in the Guelph Museum at Hanover —Lord Yarborough's being a very excellent copy—a conclusion with which Mr. Wornum is disposed to agree, although he has seen only one of the two. Another full-length of the same subject belongs to the Duke of Northumberland, but it has been damaged. There are three drawings of the Prince in the Windsor collection, but the picture at Petworth represents him at an age when Holbein could not, as we now know, have painted him.

It was in this same year that the painter was sent to take the portrait of Anne of Cleves, who arrived in England on the 27th of December, and was married in the following month. The miniature now belonging to Colonel Meyrick, which came from the collection of Mr. Barrett of Lee, has been reputed to be the likeness which was executed for Henry; but Mr. Wornum is of opinion that the portrait now in the Louvre has higher claims, and he strives hard to exculpate the painter from the charge of having misled his royal master, as he is commonly reported to have done.

Mr. Wornum gives us the following account of the pictures of Thomas Howard Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Surrey, and Queen Catherine Howard:—

'I am acquainted with no authenticated portrait of this queen by Holbein, though there is a head to which her name has been given among the Windsor drawings. Of the duke there is one important portrait, which we have in duplicate, either copied or repeated by Holbein; but of the earl, it is questionable whether there exists any picture by Holbein, though his head also is supposed to be among the Windsor drawings. There is a bust portrait of him at Arundel Castle, in cap and feather, and holding a red carnation in his left hand, but it shows no trace of Holbein's art. The large full-length of him at Knoll, which has been ascribed to Holbein, is certainly not by that painter; it is distinctly dated 1546, the earl's twenty-ninth year.' (*Wornum*, p. 337.)

Of the Duke of Norfolk's portraits, Mr. Wornum thinks the one at Arundel Castel the original; whilst Dr. Woltmann accepts that which was exhibited (No. 165) from the Queen's collection.

We meet with the painter's name in a subsidy roll for the city of London of the year 1541, as residing in the parish of St. Andrew Undershaft. In the city too still remains what was once supposed to be one of his great works—the picture representing the King granting to the Barber Surgeons the charter of the Company. This grant was made in 1541, and the picture can hardly have been executed before that time. Van Mander reports that Holbein died without completing the picture; and this is not improbable, for he did not live long afterwards, having died in 1543. Pepys went to see it in 1668, 'thinking to have bought it, by the help of Mr. Pierce, for a 'little money. I did think to give 200*l.* for it, being said to 'be worth 1000*l.*, but it is so spoiled that I have no mind to it, 'and is not pleasant, though a good picture.'

We will quote what Dr. Woltmann says after twice examining this work:—

'Holbein certainly painted no more of this picture than the 'outline of the whole composition and the faces of several 'members of the company from life, in the order in which they 'respectively sat to him. None of the heads are in their 'original state, but many of them have nevertheless a very 'splendid effect; as, for instance, immediately to the right of 'the king, the old and venerable W. Chambers, whose head 'exactly corresponds with his portrait in the Belvedere Gallery 'at Vienna; then, to the left of the king, Aylef, whose head 'seems to be the best of all. Next there is Harman, a very 'lively face with a flat nose, and behind him Monforde, a full 'beardless face, which bears a striking resemblance to that of 'Dr. Martin Luther. The other faces—for instance, that of 'Sir William Butts,* next to Chambers—are too much injured 'to pass any judgment upon them. A second row of six heads 'is most decidedly of a later period. There is not a touch of 'Holbein's pencil in them. They are wretchedly drawn, not 'one chin is correct, and the colour is a dirty yellow-looking

* The reader will no doubt remember the portraits of Sir William and Lady Butts in the National Portrait Exhibition of last year, belonging to Mr. W. Pole Carew. We are happy to say that since that exhibition closed these portraits have been carefully treated under the eye of Mr. Richmond. Dr. Butts, although injured, after the removal of some restoration bears a very different aspect from what he wore previously. The lady's portrait was in a far better state, but the backgrounds of both had been twice painted over. In their present condition both heads rank among the first examples of Holbein's work in this country, although one has suffered much more than the other.

'compound. Henry's face is painted over; originally it may 'possibly have been painted by Holbein. But the figure of 'the king is certainly not by him.

'The state of the picture does not give us a very favourable 'idea of the taste of the members of the company, who allowed 'Holbein's unfinished work to be so barbarously injured. A 'dauber finished the picture, and he has not even spared the 'parts painted by Holbein himself. The whole background is 'covered with very rudely painted fruits and flowers of a much 'later time.' (*Fortnightly Review*, No. xxxii. pp. 165-6.)

Mr. Wornum's judgment on this subject does not differ substantially from that of the German connoisseur.

The picture also exhibited of Edward VI. presenting the charters of Christ's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's hospitals in 1552, represents an event which took place after Holbein's death, and is in itself a very indifferent work; nor can the large picture at Hampton Court of Henry VIII., his queen, Prince Edward, the two princesses, with a fool on one side and a waiting-woman on the other, be acknowledged as a production of his pencil.

We fear that we have already exhausted the patience of our readers by the notice of so many single pictures, but the life of an artist is traced and illustrated by his works. We have thus left ourselves no space for considering this great master's excellence as shown in his drawings, or in his designs for architecture and for goldsmiths' work, in all of which he excelled. The British Museum and the Queen's collection afford abundant materials for seeing what he was in these departments of art.

It was commonly supposed that Holbein died in London, of the plague, at the age of fifty-six, in the year 1554. This is the account given by Van Mander, and it is repeated by Sandrart. But the discovery in the Registry of the Commissary of London of his will, dated the 7th of October 1543, and proved on the 29th of November in that year, establishes the time of his death beyond all reasonable doubt, and cuts off the pretensions of a mass of pictures, which, from the age of the persons portrayed, or the date they bear, must have been executed by others.

We quite agree with Mr. Wornum in thinking—as we clearly see he does think, although he is too courteous expressly to say so—that Mr. Redgrave's* doubts as to the identity of Hans Holbein the testator of 1543 and Hans Holbein the painter are simply absurd. In the will he is spoken of as 'servaunte to the

* See Preface to Catalogue of National Portrait Exhibition, p. v.

'King's Majestie,' and as living in the parish of St. Andrew Undershaft. We know of no other Holbein; his name does not occur afterwards in the household accounts; and we learn besides, from a document discovered by Herr His-Heusler at Basle, that he was dead before 1545, for he is spoken of as 'wylandt 'Hansen Holbein seligen.' This occurs in the letter from Adelberg Meyer, the burgomaster of Basle, to Jakob David, the goldsmith at Paris, in relation to Philip Holbein the painter's son.

One word more with reference to Mr. Wornum's book. We cannot say that it is very well written or well arranged, but we can recommend it as a careful and instructive volume to all lovers of art. At any rate we must express our gratification at finding an officer connected with our National Gallery who has at once the industry and the knowledge requisite for producing such a work. We feel that the nation derives a double advantage from the employment of Mr. Wornum, when his energies are devoted to a faithful discharge of the duties of his office, and his leisure is given up to literary labours closely connected with those duties.

ART. VI.—*The Church and the World. Essays on Questions of the Day.* Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, B.A. 1866.

DURING the last eighteen years we have witnessed within the Church of England three tremendous conflicts of opinion. Within that sacred circle—

> 'Thrice did the indignant nations league their might—
> Thrice the red darkness of the battle's night
> Shrouded the recreant terror of their flight.'

The first of these was the endeavour of the High Church party to suppress the 'Evangelical' school in the struggle between the now octogenarian Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Gorham. The second was the combination of those two parties in the struggle to suppress the 'Liberal' theologians as represented in 'Essays and Reviews.' The third is the war now carried on between a large section of the High Church party and their opponents on the subject of Ritualism. On the general position which the rulers of the Church of England ought to assume in struggles of this nature, we have already expressed ourselves in regard to the two former contests, in language which we cannot hope to strengthen, which, in the main drift

of the argument, we see no cause to modify, and which has been amply justified by the events.

We declared of the Gorham controversy that it was one which could be fairly discussed within the limits of the National Church; that it referred to doctrines on which the Universal Church in its Creeds or Councils had never expressed any opinion; and that the interest excited by it was in its very nature illusory and transitory.* We declared of the contest on Biblical Inspiration,† and on the duration of Future Punishment, that this also, though touching matters of far deeper moment, belonged to the range of questions which neither Creed nor Council in ancient times, nor the Church of England in its formularies, had ever defined; and that, although the subjects discussed were of undying interest, yet the infinitely varying shades of opinion with which they are connected would render any decision upon them at once needless and futile. In both these cases our predictions were entirely verified. The Gorham controversy is now amongst the things of the past. The old lion of Exeter very soon lay down in peace with the lamb of Brampford Speke. The leader of the High Church party has since—it is true, for polemical purposes—entered into an alliance with the most violent journal of the school which he had then denounced as denying an article of the faith. The Essay and Review controversy, though still smouldering, yet ceases to enkindle the theological mind into fury. Well-known prelates have openly avowed the views of Biblical Inspiration which the 11,000 clergy denounced as subversive of the faith. The hope of a limited duration of Future Punishment‡ has found an accepted place in the volume which we have placed at the head of our article as the organ of the extreme High Church party.

We now approach the third struggle, which is occupying the public mind at present. There are several respects in which this differs from the others. It is the revival of a contest which has been twice or thrice before raised in the Church of England. It is the revival of the contest of Laud against the Puritans; we may perhaps say, of the Nonjurors against the Latitudinarians; certainly, of the leaders of the Oxford Tracts against the mass of their fellow-churchmen in 1834–45. It differs also, down to the present moment, in this point, that the contending

---

* 'The Gorham Controversy,' Ed. Rev., July 1850.

† 'Essays and Reviews,' Ed. Rev., April 1861. 'Three Pastorals,' Ed. Rev., July 1863.

‡ Church and World, p. 240.

parties have not yet come to a pitched battle in a court of law; and that each, to a certain degree, keeps the other at bay by the threat of internecine retaliation.

In this pause, we may without impropriety descend once more into the arena, and give, as far as our limits allow, a calm survey of the main controversy. We would at the outset maintain that, on the whole, the true policy of the Church and State in this contest, as in those which preceded it, is to grant a complete toleration to the recalcitrant party, so far as is compatible with the practical unity of our ecclesiastical and parochial system. We shall see, as we advance, that in advocating the toleration of the opinions and practices in question, we are putting our principle to the severest test of which it is capable. We will also point out the limits which are necessary to render that toleration safe even for those whom it is intended to include. But the value of the principle is so indispensable to a National Church everywhere—above all to a Church whose historical origin is so fraught with compromise and comprehension as ours—that we gladly take this opportunity of once more asserting it in the broadest form which, perhaps, it has ever assumed in these pages.

The very fact, however, of advocating this legal toleration makes it more incumbent on those who deprecate the progress of such views to point out by the fair arguments of reason and fact their nature, their tendencies, and their dangers.

I. We have said that the Ritualistic development of the present day is a revival of the movements of Laud in the seventeenth century, and of Dr. Newman thirty years ago. But it has peculiarities of its own which enable us to consider it apart from them. In the precise form which gives it the name of 'Ritualist,'* it is of sudden growth—the work almost of the last three years—a phenomenon which has taken the nation and Church by surprise. At once in a hundred or more churches (so we are told) appeared coloured vestments; candles lighted during the Communion in the morning, and during the Magnificat in the afternoon; a new liturgy interpolated into that established by law; prostrations,

* We have adopted this name, both because it is the one usually adopted, and because it is accepted by the party to whom it is applied. But in itself it is as little appropriate as such designations usually are. 'A Ritualist' is, properly speaking, one who has profoundly studied the origin and history of ancient rites, such as Mabillon, Martene, Bingham, and Augusti. There are, perhaps, few to whom the term thus limited would be less suitable than most of the school who are now so called.

genuflexions, elevations, never before seen; the transformation of the worship of the Church of England into a likeness of that of the Church of Rome so exact as to deceive Roman Catholics themselves into the momentary belief that they were in their own places of worship. In asking the causes of this rapid efflorescence, we must distinguish between two perfectly distinct influences. One of these is permanent, and, with certain limitations, if not laudable, at any rate approved by many reasonable persons of all classes of opinion. The other is local, temporary, and also, with certain limitations, if not absolutely mischievous, yet repugnant to the feelings and the sense of the great mass of educated men in civilised Christendom at home and abroad.

The permanent influence is to be found in the vast wave of antiquarian, artistic, architectural, romantic sentiment which has passed over the whole of Europe, as a reaction partly against the French Revolution, but partly also against the false taste of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which the Revolution overthrew. It appeared in the revival, headed by the Quaker Rickman, of the feeling for Gothic architecture, which had in the previous ages entirely died out of the heart and mind of Europe. It appeared in the Roman Catholic Church through the protests made by such men as Pugin and Montalembert in favour of the mediæval style against the Pagan classical structures of St. Peter's and St. John Lateran. It appeared in the Oriental Church through the reverence which, under Philaret, the venerable metropolitan of Moscow, has everywhere drawn back the sympathy of the Russian clergy and laity from the innovations of Peter and Catherine to the older Byzantine forms of Ivan III. It appeared in France in the passion for Restoration which, beginning under Louis Philippe, has, almost to excess, been rehabilitating every monument of antiquity even in that most changeful of nations—the princely Castle of Blois, the Holy Chapel of St. Louis, the Cathedral of Notre Dame, and the Abbey of St. Denis. It appeared in England in the growth of a hundred archæological societies, in the rise of thousands of churches, in the reproduction, such as would have caused a shudder in our Stuart or Georgian ancestors, of the style of Henry VII.'s Chapel throughout the modern Palace of Westminster—in the awakening of popular interest in our cathedrals, in the special services which fill their naves, in the decent celebration of parochial worship, where once all was squalor and neglect. It appears even more strikingly in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Glasgow Cathedral has

been adorned with stained windows, which we discussed in our last Number.* The organ—once, with its 666 pipes, believed to be the Beast of the Apocalypse—has fought its way through more than one Presbytery, and is only waiting for a convenient season to utter its prelatical blast. A liturgy has actually been introduced into the Greyfriars' Church of Edinburgh, which witnessed the original adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant. Even the Free Church —the modern exaggeration of old Presbyterianism—has permitted the growth of churches conspicuous by the fantasy of mediæval architecture. The Nonconformist chapels of England have followed in the wake, and vast Independent congregations now meet within buildings which their forefathers would have regarded only as the fit shrines of apostasy and idolatry. So far as the rise of Ritualism is an eddy of this wide advancing tide of public feeling, it is not only not the triumph of any particular section of the Church, but it acquires a theological significance exactly the opposite of that which its chief advocates maintain. When the Ritualists claim all the phenomena of which we have been speaking as on their side, they merge themselves in the great secular movement which they seem to deprecate, they become allies of those whom in purely ecclesiastical matters they love to denounce. The true antagonist to Art and Archæology is Puritanism, not Rationalism.† The Iconoclast and the Fetichist are often swayed by the same superstition. The arch-ritualist of Scotland (Dr. Lee) is the bold and able leader of Free-thought in every direction. It is with him, and the like of him, that the Ritualists, if they move from their peculiar theological basis to claim a wider sympathy, have to shake hands and move onwards.

There is only one qualification to be made which modifies the connexion of this general historical movement with the externals of Christian worship. If, on the one hand, it be true that the love of beauty and of antiquity belongs to the more free and generous part of the development of the nineteenth century, it must also be admitted that amongst all educated men there is an increasing sense of the solemnity and grace of

* See the vindication of this restoration on Presbyterian principles advocated in the 'Pastoral Addresses' of the late lamented Dr. John Robertson, minister of the Cathedral of Glasgow—an excellent volume, which, if the style had been equal to the matter, would have entitled their author to a place amongst the theological writers of the age.

† This is admirably put in Dean Milman's 'History of Latin 'Christianity,' in speaking of the Iconoclastic Controversy.

simplicity in all public ceremonials—an increasing impatience of anything which distracts the attention from the inward to the outward in matters of real importance. Pearls and gold, drapery and tinsel, are more and more regarded as essentially 'barbaric.' The very word 'theatrical' as applied to anything serious is a term of disparagement. The stage effects and scenery of the drama, which were originally copied from the pageants of real life, have outrun their originals, and made it extremely difficult to carry on any gorgeous ceremonial without provoking an unseemly comparison with tragic and comic exhibitions. It is a characteristic story told of M. de Tocqueville, that when standing on the steps of the throne at one of the august occasions of the Opening of Parliament, he watched in silence the gathering of the Peers in their scarlet robes, the entrance of the Ministers in their official uniforms, the appearance of the Sovereign in royal magnificence, and then, when he beheld the Commons rushing to the bar in their plain, unadorned, rough, everyday dress, he exclaimed '*Voilà le Maître.*' He saw that the day was come in the nation, as in a household, when it is the servants only who appear in livery, whilst the real Master stands above formalities. The sentiment implied in this saying is the real cause of the alienation, in educated and philosophical minds, from external show, even when not associated with doctrines or ideas repugnant to them. And in this respect the general antiquarian taste of the time, whilst fostering an appreciation of architecture and a love of historical associations, is often found to be a positive check on ceremonialism or credulity in religion. No one is a more decided enemy to legend and superstition, because no one knows more about them, than a profound archæologist. No one is more apt to think simplicity the beauty of holiness than a man who enters most thoroughly into the glory of art.

We are led to make these preliminary remarks, not only because of their bearing on the general question, but because of their special connexion with one part of the controversy, which has assumed, in our judgment, a very disproportionate importance—that of the Vestments.

One reason of this exaggerated importance, doubtless, has been the extraordinary legal entanglement in which it has been involved. The Ritualists, as is well known, defend themselves—with a characteristic and audacious defiance of their own principles—against the united voice of all the bishops and of both Houses of Convocation, by appealing to an Act* of

* The Act of Uniformity, in Charles II.'s time, had no doubt the consent of the bishops, and the Prayer-book incorporated with it

Parliament passed in the reign of Elizabeth, without the consent of any bishop or of either House of Convocation. We will not go at length into the mysteries of this enactment. The main features of its history are, however, curious and instructive. It represented first the suspended judgment of the Reformers of Edward VI., just on the eve of making the complete breach between the new and old ceremonial, 'the 'torrent's smoothness ere it dash below.' It was abolished by their maturer judgment, when they published their revised Prayer-book a few years afterwards. It was revived under Elizabeth, when she, equally with the statesmen of the first years of her brother, halted between two opinions—but with the express precaution that it was merely provisional, and awaiting her further royal pleasure. That pleasure was expressed in her own reign by advertisements, and in her successor's reign by canons, both under royal authority (at a time when royal authority reached far more nearly to the level of a law than has been the case since)—prohibiting the use of these vestments anywhere except in cathedrals and collegiate churches. The Act so revived was finally adopted, but without this precaution, by the statesmen and bishops of the Restoration—a proceeding which, as they never acted upon it, must be regarded as only one other additional instance of the perfidious spirit with which they met the demands* of the Nonconformists—insulting where they could not wound, entrapping them where they dared not openly oppose them.

Such is the Act—unquestionably the letter of the law—on which the use of these vestments depends; how far capable of being sustained against the uniform usage of the Church for three centuries to the contrary, we gladly leave to lawyers to determine.

But, apart from the legal question, the controversy has an

---

had the approval of Convocation; but 'the authority of Parliament,' to which the celebrated rubric refers, depends virtually on the Act of Elizabeth, which was passed only by the Temporal Peers and the House of Commons, without reference to Convocation.

* Other instances of this policy are well known. When the declaration of the unfeigned assent and consent to *the use* of the Prayer-book, was couched in the form of assent to all and everything contained, &c., it was done in the hope that the Nonconformists, not knowing the object of the Declaration, might more easily stumble at it. When the words in the marriage service, 'I thee *worship*,' had been by common consent changed to 'I thee *honour*,' the words offensive to the Puritans were retained by the mere insolence of carelessness.

interest of its own which deserves a few moments' attention. The use or disuse of these coloured vestments is often treated by both sides as if it was the turning question between a true and a false Church; the signs to one party of the only Catholic worship, to the other, of 'the workshops of Satan.' We venture to say that, with the exception of one aspect, on which we will dwell presently, there is not in the whole course of ecclesiastical usage a ceremonial practice more absolutely void of all theological significance. Look at the origin of these vestments. Both their supporters and their opponents regard them as sacerdotal garments, symbolical of we know not what mysterious meanings. Even Milton spoke of them as borrowed from the Flamen's vestry and Aaron's wardrobe. What is the actual case? They have not the slightest tincture of Flamen or priest in their whole descent. They are the dresses of the Syrian peasant or the Roman gentleman, retained by the clergy when they had been left off by the rest of society; just as the bishops long preserved the last relics of the flowing wigs of the time of Charles II., as the Blue-coat boys recall the common dress of children under Edward VI., as Quakers maintain the sober costume of the Commonwealth, as a clergyman's bands, which have been regarded as symbolical of the Cloven Tongues, of the two Testaments, of the two Tables of the Law, are but the remains of the turned-down collars of the time of James I. Their very names bear witness to the fact that there was originally no outward distinction whatever between clergy and laity. They thus strike, if they have any historical significance at all, at the root of the vast hierarchical system, of which they are now made the badges and ornaments. The 'alb' is but the white shirt or tunic, still kept up in the white dress of the Pope, which used to be worn by every peasant next his skin,* and in southern countries was often his only garment. A variety of it, introduced by the Emperors Commodus and Heliogabalus, with long sleeves, was, from the country whence they brought it,† called the Dalmatica. The 'pall' is the pallium, the woollen cloak, generally the mark of philosophers, wrapped round the shirt like a plaid or shawl. The overcoat, in the days of the Roman Empire as in ours, was constantly changing its fashion and its name; and the slang designations by which it was known have been perpetuated in the ecclesiastical vocabulary and are now used with bated breath, as if speaking of things too sacred to be men-

* Tertullian (Spect. c. 23). Clemens. Alex. (Pædag. iii. 8.)
† Bingham, Book vi. §§ 4, 18–20.

tioned. One such overcoat was the *cape* or *cope*, also called *pluviale*, the 'waterproof.' Another was the *chasuble*, or *casula*, 'the little house,'* as the Roman labourer called the smock frock in which he shut himself up when out at work in bad weather. Another was the *caracalla*, or *caraca*, or *casaca*, 'the cassock,' † brought by the Emperor who derived his own surname from it, when he introduced it from France. The 'surplice' is the barbarous garment, the 'over-fur' (*superpellicium*), ‡ only used in the North, where it was drawn over the skins of beasts in which our German and Celtic ancestors were clothed. It was the common garb—'the white coat' (*cotta candens*)—worn by the regular clergy not only in church, but in ordinary life. In the oldest Roman mosaic, that in the church of Sta. Pudentiana, of the fourth century, the Apostles are represented in the common classical costume of the age. No thought had entered the mind of the Church, even at that time, of investing even the most sacred personages with any other than ordinary dresses.

In like manner, when we pass from the first origin of these vestments to their retention by the Reformers of the English Church, although they had lost this primitive character, they were still merely kept up for decency or for comeliness. These reasons alone are advanced as the grounds for the use of the surplice, and the 'decent cope' in cathedrals is to be confined to the 'principal minister' of the chapter at the Communion. If it was extended further by custom, it was merely for the sake of additional splendour. So the Dean and Prebendaries of Westminster Abbey have at the coronations always worn copes, not to symbolise any particular office or part of the service, but to be in harmony with the general magnificence of the procession. So Archbishop Williams dressed up in copes, not merely the officiating ministers, but all the 'quire men,' lay as well as clerical, in order to increase the pomp of the reception of the French ambassadors.

The bishops immediately before the Reformation wore copes not only in their episcopal ministrations, but in Parliament. The episcopal 'rochet' is simply 'a little coat' (*rocket*) worn by the bishops at that time on all occasions, except when they went out hunting (*nisi cum venantur*); § and the satin 'chimere'

---

* Facciolati, in voce *Cucullatus*. The same metaphor appears in our word 'coat,' which is the mediæval '*cotta*,' equally used for a 'coat,' and a 'cot,' or 'cottage.'

† Bingham, book vi. §§ 4, 20.

‡ Ducange *in voce*.

§ Hody's History of Convocation.

is the loose gown or scarf, 'the light cymar' worn by ladies, or by persons of quality in riding.*

If, by some unlucky chance, the fashion of these red and green garments should spread, there is no obstacle, in principle, to their adoption by the most latitudinarian or the most Puritan of our divines. Nay, even in the High Church party itself, we have seen how rapidly such badges change their meaning. The surplice, for which twenty, or even ten years ago, clergymen were willing to endanger the peace of their neighbourhood and the welfare of their parishes, is now by the representatives of the very same party denounced as 'a white frock'—'a rag 'of Protestantism.' Nor is this change of feeling confined to the upholders of ritualism. After one of the well-known disturbances in St. George's-in-the-East, an old woman was observed straining her eyes to see what colour would be worn by the new clergyman when he emerged from the vestry. At last on his appearance in the usual preaching-gown, she burst into tears, and exclaimed, 'Thank God, it is black!' Had the same good old creature lived to our days, she might have been disposed, even at the sight of the common surplice, to exclaim, 'Thank God, it is white!'

Therefore we repeat that any legislation on these affairs of millinery, however necessary it may at last become in order to clear up the ambiguity of a law left by its treacherous framers in designed obscurity, will touch but a very small part of the matter. These garments, it is true, have been made symbolical of doctrines and practices with which they have no connexion; but the doctrines and the practices will remain even if the garments are removed, just as the doctrines and the practices might perish even if the garments were retained.

II. But the real mischief of these practices lies quite in another direction; and we are anxious that the public attention should be fixed on the issues of true importance, and not on trivialities which shift with every wind of fashion.

The first of these evils arises when, whether by arraying themselves in unusual colours or by any other startling innovation, the clergy fly in the face of constituted authorities or of their congregations. This is an evil which in point of fact might arise equally from either of the two main sections of the ecclesiastical world. A Puritan clergyman might create a disorder by suddenly wearing a black gown, when his congregation had been accustomed to a surplice; or by removing the communion-table, in strict conformity with the rubric, from the

* Archæol. xxx. 17.

chancel into the body of the church in accordance with the undoubted law of the church, and with its unquestioned practice from Ridley to Laud. But it has rarely been by this school of the clergy that the episcopal authority has been set at nought. It has been reserved for those by whom the bishops are professedly regarded as the successors of the Apostles, as the one evidence of a true Church, to treat them with a contempt and a defiance which in no other profession of men would be tolerated from inferiors to superiors. No dissenter, no presbyterian, has ever lavished on the episcopal order fouler language than that which is weekly poured forth by the organs of the Ritualist party against those whom they theoretically regard as the oracles of the Christian Church. And in like manner, though less frequently, the congregations, or the leading persons in the congregations, are equally ignored, when their wishes come into conflict with the desire of the clergyman, perhaps instigated by a few hotheaded youths from his own or other parishes, to introduce ceremonies which cannot by any possibility be edifying except to those who sympathise with them.

To what results this has led, on more than one occasion, it is needless to remind our readers. The scenes at St. George's-in-the-East are still fresh in the recollection of many. The vast church, crowded to the roof with a congregation, not of worshippers, but of furious zealots, trying to thunder down the chanting of the liturgy by their own responses; every allusion in the prayers or lessons which could be construed into a condemnation of idolatry received with a round of coughing, as the mark of their sincere approbation; the clergy and choristers vainly striving to carry on the service, under the protection of policemen, within the chancel rails, 'like mice in a cage, 'surrounded by an army of starved cats,'—to use the graphic expression of an eye-witness—the very same congregation, at a simpler service afterwards, falling at once into the attitude of devotion and attention—furnished lessons of ecclesiastical history, if full of scandal, yet full also of instruction.

Doubtless several causes combined to produce the result in that particular case: the ruffianly neighbourhood, the presence of a polemical lecturer, the singular convenience of the church for the strategics of the escalading party, perhaps the inadequacy of the law, or the indifference of its administrators. But still the original cause was the intrusion of a novel rite in a parish unprepared to receive it. To such a state of anarchy could a congregation, in itself respectable, be reduced by the pertinacious adherence of a clergyman, in other respects amiable,

sensible, and conciliatory, to the colour of a vestment, or the intonation of a voice. Whenever such a collision occurs, the authority of law, whether through the bishop or the legislature, should intervene—not on account of the ceremony itself in question—but to suppress an enormous scandal, to protect a congregation whose legal rights are outraged by one who was appointed to serve them as the minister and representative of order, to check a breach of the first maxims of Christian faith, charity and wisdom. We are not disposed to overstate the extent to which episcopal authority should be strained. In matters of opinion, a bishop is a man and nothing more. The value of his sentiments depends on the weight of character, learning, or genius which he brings to his high office, or which his high office evokes. But in matters of discipline, if in anything, he has a claim to be heard. In no other profession would the advice of a commanding-officer be disregarded by his inferiors in matters of mere external observance; and where, as in the cases supposed, the disobedience threatens the peace and safety of a parish, it deserves the strongest reprobation.

III. But, in fact, this insubordination against bishops—this contempt of the rights of parish and congregation (where it exists)—is in itself part of the still larger peril, of which Ritualism is but a very superficial development, which may exist equally without cope or chasuble, and which throws these lesser follies wholly into the shade. In entering here on the real danger of the ecclesiastical movement of our day, we would call attention once more to the fact that, whilst it might be possible to restrain the mere ceremonial extravagances by additional legal penalties, this vaster mischief is one which legal enactments can hardly reach, or reach only through remedies which would be worse than the evils.

It is our hope that by clearly stating what those evils are we may render some service in awakening the more moderate adherents of this system to the perils of the course to which they give their sanction, and which, by the pressure of more astute politicians above them, and of more vehement partisans behind them, hurries them on, in spite of themselves, to excesses which in heart they deprecate, whilst in act they encourage.

There are many who would regard the conscious imitation of anything that relates to the Church of Rome one of the foremost offences of the Ritualistic party. The fact is undoubted. The coloured vestments are evidently adopted, not because of their antiquity—for their first origin, as we have seen, is significant of no doctrine whatever—but simply because

they are Roman. It would appear that the Thirty-nine Articles are repudiated, the title of Protestant rejected, and the great name of Luther disparaged, not so much from any fixed conviction on the subjects themselves, as because these stand as bulwarks or barriers between the mass of Englishmen and the Church of the Pope. But it is not on this account that the attitude of this party is open to grave objection. Approximation to Rome, or to any other Church than our own, is not of itself an evil. The doctrine that the Pope is Antichrist is indeed held by some Protestant fanatics to be the article of a falling or a standing Church, but this is not the position either of the Church of England or of any large number of educated men. The letter of the Thirty-nine Articles has broken down on so many other points, that we would not deal harshly even with those who thus cast off at least one-third of the doctrines which the Articles were designed to enforce. They claim a latitude for themselves which they constantly refuse to others. Let them have it. But what is offensive to common sense—what vitiates the position of men otherwise estimable—is the painful striving after a system which they have not, and which they try to grasp by seizing the shadow when they know that they cannot enjoy the substance. To Roman Catholics themselves the attempt appears ludicrous. The walls of the Vatican resound with laughter at the reports which penetrate thither of the mimicry of rites which are natural to them, but which they feel must be artificial to others. There is no doubt a strain on every honest mind in bearing the immense weight of the traditional hereditary system of the Roman Catholic Church; but the strain is far greater when this weight is self-imposed—when some of the most startling forms of its worship are not merely accepted as parts of an ancient whole, but are dragged out into disproportionate prominence by the fancy of individual minds.

It is one of the paradoxes of the Ritualist school that 'no 'public worship is really deserving of the name unless it be 'histrionic.'* But surely they themselves would acknowledge

* 'Church and World,' p. 37. A few words should be devoted to this work, which, we presume, is to be regarded as the organ of the Ritualist school. It is a volume of very unequal interest, composed on the principle of 'Essays and Reviews;' that is, of a collection of Essays on kindred subjects, 'written independently of one another,' and 'by authors responsible only for the statements contained in 'their own contributions.' It would be the height of injustice in this case, as in that of which this is a copy, to ascribe to each of the writers the opinions of all the others, and therefore it was an act of

that in worship, as in other parts of the religious life, some deference is due to the literal sense of the contrary maxim, 'Beware of hypocrisy' (*ὑπόκρισις*), that is, 'of acting a part.' And this 'histrionic' or 'hypocritical' element (whether we take the Latin or the Greek word) becomes doubly questionable in proportion as the part enacted is remote from ourselves. We do not deny that in every kind of ritual a divergence must often exist between the earthly feelings of the worshipper and the unearthly language in which all our devotion must be expressed. But this divergence between form and reality is increased beyond all proportion when the minister is not only assuming gestures, dresses, and words which are in themselves more or less theatrical, but when those forms and frames of thought are consciously borrowed from another society to which he does not belong. Sir Walter Scott used to tell with much zest a story of a man who tried to frighten his friend by encountering him at midnight on a lonely spot which was supposed to be the resort of a ghostly visitant. He took his seat on the haunted stone wrapt in a long white sheet. Presently, to his horror, the real ghost appeared, and sat down beside him, with the ominous ejaculation, 'You are a ghost, 'and I am a ghost; let us come closer and closer together.' And closer and closer the ghost pressed, till the sham ghost, overcome with terror, fainted away. This, we fear, is the fate which awaits the Ritualist imitators of the Church of Rome. That mighty ghost—'the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire' —the ghost of the dead middle ages—will press closer and closer to our poor dressed-up ghost, till the greater absorbs the lesser or deprives it, by mere juxtaposition, of any true spiritual life. We would, in all sincerity, submit to those who adopt this histrionic worship and theology, that there is, in the very attitude which they assume, a fantastic show of religion, extremely difficult to combine with its inward reality. If one out of twenty is able to unite it with devotional fervour and practical activity,

---

unnecessary prudence when one of the contributors, finding that the book awakened an unexpected clamour, withdrew from his place in the volume. In one curious respect the fate of the book has differed from that of its predecessor. The Essays on the 'Church 'and the World' were, unlike the 'Essays and Reviews,' presented to the Upper House of Convocation by an eminent Prelate, who 'took it for granted that it would be interesting to the House,' and so offered it for acceptance even without opening its cover. Since that time the same Prelate has explained that it was received by the House on the same principle, 'that the Jesuits' library was the most 'perfect repository of all heretical books in the world.'

there must be nineteen out of twenty who are in danger of losing all sense of the great things of life in the punctilious and religious observance of practices which, not being natural, can only be retained in the mind by an effort, to say the least, exceedingly unwholesome.

IV. Connected with this part of the development is the view of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is made by the Ritualists the centre of their new practices. It is possible that, since the lucid judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1857 on the appeal of *Liddell v. Westerton*, even they may have learned to attach less importance than they then did to the shape and materials of the Communion-table. It is now, we hope, well known that the oldest form of the Holy Table was, as its name implies, a wooden table and nothing more; and that the stone structure which centuries afterwards took its place had even then no connexion with a Pagan or Jewish altar, but was a reproduction of the rock-hewn grave or marble tomb, in which the relics of martyrs were supposed to be enshrined. It is possible that the Credence-table, which used to be regarded as a kind of bulwark of high sacramental views, may now have come to be judged in its true light as an adjunct rather of a table than an altar, being in fact the sideboard from which the Credentiarius, or accredited taster in the barbarous times when the name and thing were invented, ascertained whether or not the food was poisoned. But there still remains a cloud of misconception on this subject, through which we can but hope to penetrate to a few leading characteristics of its relation to the present controversy.

When we remember what the original ordinance was—when we call to mind the upper chamber, with the evening meal and the recumbent guests—when we recollect the scenes in the Primitive Church, which almost brought it within the range of a common banquet—when we reflect on its original object, as a pledge of love between Christians and Christians, as an offering of grateful hearts, as a self-dedication to the Master who had dedicated Himself for them—it is with difficulty that we can track our way through the long descent of centuries, during which it has become 'the Dreadful Sacrifice,' the Miracle of Bolsena, the centre of strange fables and still stranger discords, the battlefield of scholastic theologians, of warring nations, of conflicting sects, of the fierce struggles of Abelard and Bernard, of John Ziska and the Emperor Sigismond, of the Reformed Churches against each other and against Rome. Logic, rhetoric, prosaic want of imagination, and imagination run wild, bad metaphysics, and misguided politics have done

their worst on that simple and sacred rite, till the true miracle seems to be that it survived at all. 'Men have turned the 'key in this lock so often,' says Jeremy Taylor, 'till it cannot 'be either opened or shut.' We must not be surprised, therefore, if in the fluctuations of the English Reformation, in the perplexities which beset the mind first of Cranmer and then of Elizabeth on this very subject, the ambiguity and contradiction of their doctrine should have left its traces throughout the English formularies, and even in the very words of the administration of the sacred elements. The two conflicting views thus meet in the communion of the Anglican Church even if nowhere else. We would not disturb them. So far as we can penetrate through the mist of words in which the leaders of this school envelope their meaning, they are in this respect neither more nor less than Lutherans, and it is no reproach to the English Church that Luther and Zwingle should under her auspices close their ceaseless struggle against each other. It may be true, as Mr. Hallam observes, that, logically speaking, there can be nothing predicated concerning a body in its relation to a given space but presence * and absence. But the perversity of human fancy, the ambiguity of human words, and the complexity of human parties, have hitherto rendered a simple statement of the case well nigh impossible. Even the Canon of the Roman Mass 'can only by 'the most violent artifices of interpretation be reconciled with 'the dogma of transubstantiation which was defined many cen-'turies after the Canon † was fixed.' Still, without embarking on a theological discussion which would far outrun our limits, there are two points on which we would firmly, and we would even hope with the concurrence of the better spirits of the High Church school itself, protest against the direction in which their favourite dogma is now pushed. One is the disposition shown in the minute machinery and casuistry of the 'Direc-'torium Anglicanum,' and like works of the Ritualist party, to bring out the material, carnal, local elements of the Sacrament in the most startling prominence. To this, and to this alone, must be referred the contorted attitudes and changes of dress and physical precautions which, though intended to be reverent, provoke the most painful profaneness. Now, whatever view be taken of the Eucharist,‡ it is evident to a reasonable mind

* Constitutional History of England, vol. i. p. 124.

† Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, p. 96.

‡ This is brought out with great force in some striking sermons preached before the University of Cambridge by the Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies, on 'Morality according to the Lord's Supper.'

that the spiritual ought to preponderate over the carnal. Were our Saviour actually present, He Himself would tell us that His bodily form profited nothing, that His words and His spirit only were the source of life and strength. Even if we are to admit the unhappy posthumous correction of the vexed stanza in the 'Christian Year,' and read that He is present 'as in 'the hands, so in the heart,' we must all hold that the presence in the heart is infinitely more important than the presence in the hands. This, we believe, would be the thought of the more spiritually-minded even of devout Roman Catholics. The reverse of this, we regret to think, is the almost inevitable inference from such practices as those to which we refer.

The other accompaniment of this doctrine runs out into a larger field. It is the exaltation of the Minister into a Priest, and the exaltation of a Priest into an indispensable channel of communication between God and man. This again is not, of necessity, the result of the material view, erroneous as we think it, of the Sacramental Presence. It was not held by Luther and the churches which bear his name. And there are, we believe, high authorities even in the Church of Rome who maintain that as in Baptism so in the Eucharist, the intervention of a Priest, technically so called, is not of the essence of the Sacrament. But the peculiar sacredness of the Priesthood is one of the chief ends proposed by the school whose tenets we are now discussing, not only at the present time, but at their first revival in the 'Tracts for the Times,' when the Apostolical Succession was the one doctrine reiterated, tract after tract, sermon after sermon, with every variety of emphasis. Here again it is doubtless extremely difficult to ascertain what is the precise effect they ascribe to Absolution, or what the precise authority to the words of a Bishop or a Priest. But they unquestionably believe themselves, and wish others to believe, that they are the depositaries of mystical, preternatural, we might almost say magical influences, independent of any moral or spiritual graces, and communicated to no one else but themselves. One of their leaders has said that the opposition to their system is tantamount to a rejection of 'the belief of any medium between the soul and God.' We believe that this truly expresses the state of the case. The acceptance or the rejection of this belief is the turning point of the whole controversy. Helps, indeed, assistances innumerable, not only through the clergy, the Sacraments, and the Bible, but through example, through art, through nature, through science, through history, through poetry, through church, through home, through school, through love, through friendship,

through advice, the human soul has always needed and will always need, in her arduous, ever-retarded, upward flight towards a better world. But the belief in a fixed, external, necessary 'medium between the soul and God' on earth, is exactly that which—if we have rightly read the Psalms of David, the Epistles of Paul, and the Gospel of Christ, if we have learned anything from the sufferings and scandals of the Church before the Reformation and since—true Religion is always striving to dispense with, and the more it can be dispensed with, the nearer and higher is the communion of the human spirit with its Maker and its Redeemer.

V. Growing out of these sacerdotal pretensions, though not, unhappily, confined to persons of this persuasion, is the extreme intolerance of the school to which the Ritualists belong. Indeed, one point on which these external displays deserve some commiseration, and even commendation, is that they have afforded an innocent occupation and diversion from pursuits far more reprehensible. It is far better to be busy about a vestment or a ceremony than to be always on the scent for heresy, always hounding on the religious world to some new object of suspicion and attack. The determination not merely to have their own way, but to allow no contrary practice or opinion to exist beside them, is one of the fixed characteristics of the High Church party during the whole of the long story of their existence in the Church of England. Such was the extravagant design of Laud, which brought down the Church and monarchy in ruins round his head. Such was the ever-narrowing circle of the Nonjurors, each section of that small party anathematising the other, and all of them anathematising the Church and nation from which they had separated. Such were the 'fierce thoughts' by his own candid confession, with which the distinguished leader of the Oxford movement of the Tracts* commenced his crusade against every form of liberal views. Such was the attempt of the same party, when, not content with having themselves entire freedom to preach what they believed to be the true doctrine on the mysterious subject of the effects of baptism, they sought every means to expel from the Church those who, whether on the Puritan or Liberal side, varied from their own narrow position. Such has been the career of this same party, revived within the last few years, by the energies of the anonymous champion who through the pages of our respected Conservative contemporary, sounded the tocsin of what was intended to be an implacable war against the advocates of free inquiry

* Newman's Apologia, pp. 97, 120, 131.

and Biblical criticism in the Church of England—a war which ended indeed in the total rout of the assailants, but which, nevertheless, raged long enough to show what amount of mercy and justice were to be expected from this school, if ever it gained the upper hand. Such is still the attitude of the same party and its chiefs whenever it has the opportunity of showing itself. It still exhibits, wherever there is a person of liberal opinions sufficiently unpopular to make it safe to attack him, the same polemical virulence. It still persists in insultingly ignoring the Christian graces, almost the existence, of the venerable Churches of Scotland, Germany, and Switzerland, which, in spite of their divergence from Episcopacy, the Fathers of Anglicanism recognised as parts of our common Christendom, and bound to us by indissoluble links of gratitude and affection.

Doubtless there have always been brilliant exceptions. Even Laud was far gentler to the latitudinarian and 'ever-memo-'rable' Hales than his spiritual successors would be in like case. Ken, in the conflicts of the Nonjurors, as on many other occasions of his blameless life, proved himself a real saint by rising above the sins which his party regarded as virtues. Dr. Newman, as the earnestness of the contest waxed deeper, became more and more alive to the excellence of eminent men of opposite schools, to whom at one time he had almost denied the name of Christian.* Many there are no doubt, at present, in the same circles who discern the seriousness of the times in which we live,† and would fain act and speak with a charity and a patience corresponding. It has always seemed to us a glorious possibility for the English High Church party to have taken up a position, which none could have occupied so well, of treating from their own point of view, kindly and reverently and impartially, the questions which the zealots, either of Calvinism or of Liberalism, are tempted to handle too harshly and too exclusively, and with too little regard to the great historical exigencies of Christendom. More than once such a golden opportunity was open both to the Episcopal and the theological chiefs of this party. Most deeply do we regret for their sake—for the sake of the Church—that it was recklessly thrown away, and that the gravest and the most interesting questions of religion have been by their perverse tactics entangled with the personalities of the moment,

---

* Newman's Apologia, p. 98.

† We have much pleasure in mentioning, as examples of such a spirit, some recent articles in a well-known High Church periodical, the 'Christian Remembrancer.'

with the triumph of eager partisans, with an almost total disregard of the truth or falsehood of the points at issue.

VI. Another characteristic of the party, also springing from its enormous ecclesiastical pretensions, is the anti-social and anti-national tendency of its proceedings. There is one shape which this tendency has taken, developed with unusual strength at the present moment, namely, its jealousy of the civil power. In Laud's time, the friendship between Charles and the Archbishop, and the peculiar views of the High Church party on the Divine right of kings, whatever other evils were thereby entailed, had the advantage of attaching the ecclesiastical party at least to one great institution of the realm — the monarchy. The descendants of Laud would be revolted at his exaltation of the civil power, and no Erastianism has ever gone further in expression than when he restored to the Coronation Service the prayer that the King might have the 'keys of Peter 'and the doctrine of Paul.' But from the time of the revival of the Laudian principles by Dr. Newman and his followers, the hatred of the State has become a fixed idea of the school, gaining more and more ascendancy over it, till in our day it has almost reached the height of a monomania. The 'Tracts for the Times' took their origin in the indignation expressed by the High Church party at the suppression of the Irish bishoprics by the Government. Dr. Newman, in his 'Apologia,' has told us repeatedly that the anti-Erastian views of Church polity were one of the most prominent features of the movement; how on this point, and on this point alone, he sympathised with Whately, whose anonymous work on that subject 'made his blood boil 'with enthusiasm.' From that time the tradition of the school has never wavered, and has now reached the point at which almost every theological passion is tame in comparison with it. It appears in the interminable warfare waged by the High Church clergy against the 'Conscience Clause'—a point which brings out in the strongest relief the extravagance of their doctrine, because all, with a very few exceptions, acknowledge that they do of their own will that which, when the law enjoins, they regard as detestable. There is hardly a clergyman to be found who in his own parish school will not exempt children of Nonconformists from the teaching of the Church of England formularies. But when this is embodied in an Order of Council, it is denounced as a subversion of the faith. In the matter of the Conscience Clause, the State is to them in the position which Pascal reports M. Arnauld to occupy in the eyes of the Jesuists. 'He never can be orthodox, for what 'is orthodoxy in the mouth of every one else becomes heresy

'when uttered by him.' Hence also the pertinacious exaltation of purely clerical authority against the State, whether as represented in the Sovereign, the Parliament, the Courts of Law, or the Privy Council. Hence, in spite of the sober warnings of Burke and the grave rebuke of Hallam, arose, first, the eager longings for the revival of Convocation, and the extravagant hopes entertained, and even now not wholly extinguished, of the splendid results which would flow from it. Hence, in the general tone of that venerable body, the studied disparagement of Parliament, the cheers at every allusion to the chance of escape from the 'galling fetters' of the State, the irritation at every suspicion that measures affecting the Church, even of the most beneficial character, can be passed by the Legislature without a recognition of the power of 'the Synod of the Province of Canterbury.' Hence the wild enthusiasm with which, in great measure, for the sake of such a recognition, though merely formal, the Convocation received the measure for effecting those very changes in the subscriptions of the clergy which for years it had steadily resisted. Hence the increasing hostility to the nomination of the higher dignities of the Church by the Government. The intervention of the supreme authority of the State to give the august sanction of the law and of the commonwealth to the highest officers of religion is regarded as an intrusion into the sanctuary, a degradation of the episcopal office, a neutralisation of all the once boasted glories of our cathedral establishments. When as Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon, by a stroke of his pen, erased from the Consecration service one of its most important rubrics,* that enforcing the necessity of the mandate of the Sovereign, which formed the last link of connexion between the Canadian clergy and the mother Church, and left the Canadian bishoprics henceforth to be the undisputed prey of fierce party conflicts carried on with all the violence and scandal of hotly contested elections, municipal or Parliamentary, he was hailed as a deliverer of the Canadian Church, as the inaugurator of a blessed liberty which, it was almost openly desired, might one day reach back to England. The vehement agitation carried on by this party to alter the

* The Royal licence for the consecration of the Bishops represents an important principle, not peculiar to the Church of England. In all the older churches of Europe the consent of the Sovereign was, in almost all is still, required in like manner. The reason is obvious. It was regarded as the necessary check on an undue multiplication of centres of ecclesiastical power, the necessary protection of the State against the undue claims of clerical rule.

Supreme Court of Final Appeal, though doubtless much of its acrimony arose from the bitter disappointment of a party foiled in its attempt to suppress opinions and exclude persons distasteful to its chiefs, yet sprung in great measure from the repugnance to the decision of ecclesiastical matters by any but ecclesiastical tribunals. It was this which caused the exulting shout of a respected leader of the school, when, in a moment of premature triumph, he fancied that one of the late Judgments had given over the clergy in the dioceses of Capetown and Natal to the irresponsible, uncontrolled despotism of the metropolitan of that province—'The Church of South 'Africa is *free!*' It is this which has inspired that metropolitan with the view that the Bishops of the Church of England are no better than policemen.* It is this which is practically followed out at home by that contemptuous defiance of the episcopal authority of which we have already spoken. Here, as in regard to the Conscience Clause, it would seem as if the partisans of this school read the apostolic precept backwards, and made it their avowed principle to resist every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, and to disobey the powers that be because they are not ordained of God. To be just and discriminating towards Dissenters becomes wrong if it is ordered by the Privy Council of the Queen. To disregard the authority or the injunction of a Bishop acquires, in their eyes, a new merit, from the fact that, besides being their ecclesiastical superior, he is clothed with the majesty of the law of their country, appointed by the supreme authority of the realm.

We have drawn out these indications, which might be multiplied indefinitely, to show the most formidable, the most direct, and most mischievous object at which the party represented by the Ritualists is aiming. It is the most formidable, because it falls in with two currents of feeling from very opposite quarters—the shortsighted though conscientious desire of a large body of Nonconformists for a separation of Church and State, and the religious indifference of some of the philosophical Liberals. Signs are not wanting that these three forces may at last conspire to destroy the rare combination which, with all its shortcomings, exhibits one of the noblest works which God's Providence through a long course of ages has raised up in Europe. We do not deny that State and Church, each in its relations to the

---

* 'The definition of the faith of the Church by Civil judges . . . reduces each Bishop to the position of a mere officer of the State ; *a policeman under the government of the day*,' &c. (*Letter of the Bishop of Cape Town to the Diocese of Cape Town*, p. 28, Jan. 19, 1867.)

other, as well as each by itself, need immense changes in order to make them represent worthily (we are not now speaking of the political, but) the religious condition of England. The State needs to become more and more alive to what it may effect in raising the social and moral position of the mass of our people. The Church needs to be stretched to the utmost limits of which it is capable, in the hope of making it truly worthy of the name of National. But the framework of the system which these zealots are bent on destroying opens a prospect of future usefulness which, once lost, can never be recalled, and which, once fairly grasped, will secure a field for religious liberty and religious progress such as the world has never before witnessed. Of all the deviations from the grand traditions of the Reformed Church of England on which the Ritualist party has embarked, none is wider than their repudiation of that joint action of Church and State, that subordination of the clerical power to the supremacy of law which forms the crowning characteristic of the English Reformation, of sound English philosophy and theology. This was the theory stamped on all the acts of the Tudor Sovereigns in all the magnificence of diction which is peculiar to that creative age. This, as Dr. Newman observed, with the subtle keenness of hostile criticism, is brought out with every prominence that multiplicity of expression, largeness of type, reiteration of emphasis can give, throughout our Liturgy. This inspired the greatest work of English theology—the 'Ecclesi-'astical Polity' of Richard Hooker—from end to end, breathing into it his noble description of the dignity of law, his fine sense of the intrinsic indifference of ecclesiastical forms, his elaborate, perhaps too elaborate, delineation of the identity of the Christian Commonwealth with the Christian Church. This was the ruling thought of the grave good sense of Selden, of much of the high political philosophy of Burke, and of the religious philosophy of Coleridge. This was the vision which to realise, both in practice and in speculation, was to Arnold 'that 'great work,' to use his own words on the last evening of his life, 'at which he would fain have done something before the 'night cometh, if he might be permitted to take part in it.' The Royal Supremacy was the outward shape in which the Fathers of the English Reformation expressed this thought. The identity of Church and State was the form which it assumed in the mind of those eminent men of whom we have just spoken. But it is not for any precise form of that doctrine, but for its practical operation, that we are now pleading, as endangered by the adverse influence against which we have been in these pages contending. It is (to express

ourselves shortly) the control of all persons and causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, by the law of the land. It is the recognition of the duty of the State to guide and lead the religious teachers of the country onwards to the high end, which its rulers discover, often long before* it has broken in upon the narrower vision of any particular profession, even the most sacred. It is the exercise of its true power by the Church—that is, the Christian community—over the clergy in the only form in which in a great country and in our complex civilisation it can be exercised, through the voice of the whole lay mind of the nation, expressed in the Government, the law, the legislature, the literature, of a free people. It is the opening, thereby afforded, for the gradual unfolding of the new truths which science or criticism bring to light, so as to penetrate, without a violent or convulsive effort, into the circle which often most needs, and at the same time most repels, their admission. It is the refuge for the vast floating mass of our large and mixed society to whom the technical or restricted expressions of particular sects are odious, but the wide and diversified forms of a comprehensive system are natural and attractive. This, and much more than this, is what we are called upon to sacrifice—for the sake, it may be, of the pleasure of wearing a red instead of a white dress, or for the sake of the yet more questionable pleasure of driving out of the Church, at our own will, those whose opinions or whose tempers irritate us. 'A Free Church 'in a Free State!'—O most ambiguous phrase!—even in the mouth of Cavour, as an eminent foreign statesman has expressed it, but a 'mauvais calembourg,' and in the mouth of those ecclesiastics who have now taken it under their protection, meaning only too clearly 'an enslaved Clergy amidst an in-'different Laity'—a State, where the Government shall so thoroughly despise the Church as not to think it worth controlling—a Church, where the clergy are so dependent either on their congregations or their bishops as to lose all self-respect, all power of self-improvement. What such a Free Church may become we see in a milder form in those Canadian elections of bishops, of which we have already spoken, where a 'race for the mitre' represents the candidates for the bishopric, who, as the vacancy for the see looms on the horizon, appear under the figures drawn from the vehemence of a Parliamentary canvass or the more vulgar language of the turf. We see it in a more lively shape on the more fiery soil

* This function of Government was well expressed in a speech of the Duke of Argyll in Edinburgh before the Bible Society in 1862.

of Africa, where, in the late pretended judgment of the Bishop of Capetown, 'the unexpected release from the "galling '"fetters" and "ignominious bondage" of the Royal Su-'premacy was unhappily accompanied by a no less complete 'emancipation from the rules and principles of English law and 'justice. The result showed how dangerous it would be to 'entrust a purely ecclesiastical tribunal with the administration 'of justice in ecclesiastical causes: how surely the divine would 'get the better of the judge; how easily the most upright and 'conscientious men might be betrayed by their zeal for truth 'into the most violent and arbitrary proceedings; exercising a 'usurped jurisdiction by the mockery of a trial.'*

Truly may the illustrious prelate from whom these words are quoted express the hope that 'there are many who will 'learn from this example of the fruits of sacerdotal indepen-'dence better to appreciate the blessings we enjoy in the 'institutions under which we live, notwithstanding the oppro-'brious names cast upon them by some who rest and ruminate 'under their shade.' In that South African province, we know how, by withholding the incomes of the clergy opposed to his opinions, by excommunications lavished on those who take a different view of ecclesiastical government, the ministers of the so-called Free Church may be reduced to entire dependence on their metropolitan; new bishops may be multiplied without check or hindrance by the casting vote of an assembly representing the minority of the religious community; but we also know certainly how peace does not reign, nor knowledge flourish, nor charity abound. Yet, with these dangers before our eyes, there are amongst us able, and in many respects excellent men, who rejoice at every spread of this license of tyranny—who hail what they call their coming deliverance, who look forward with eager expectation to the preposterous scheme of a 'Free 'National Council'—that is, of English and American bishops gathered from all parts of the world at the shortest possible notice, without law, without order, without knowing wherefore they are gathered together, to decide questions of the utmost importance to all the churches which they are supposed to represent. The excellent Primate who has been persuaded to invite them doubtless intends them to come merely to a meeting of friendly intercourse. But the avowed object of the gathering by those who have set it on foot, both from the South and from the West,†

* Charge of the Bishop of St. David's, 1866, p. 69.

† See the Charge of the Bishop of Capetown in 1865, and his letter to his diocese in 1867; also the appendix to a Sermon on the Pan-Anglican Synod by the Bishop of Montreal in 1867.

is something very different; and it will require all the discretion of the Episcopate of England, and all the vigilance of English public opinion, to see to it that amongst the Episcopal visitants there are not swords wreathed in myrtle and engines of war in the semblance of offerings of peace—harmless only if useless—fraught with mischief if with any pretensions to authority, or any intention of making such polemical declarations as its supporters expect it to pronounce. When we see one High Church divine* openly rejoicing in the fall of all Established Churches, and another hailing† the arrival of these strangers to override the calmer decisions of our English judges and prelates, the vision rises before us of the adverse divinities, who, under the guise of fatal gifts, betrayed the city of Priam to its ruin.

> 'Hic ubi *disjectas moles, avulsaque saxis*
> Saxa vides, mixtoque undantem pulvere fumum,
> Neptunus muros, magnoque emota tridenti
> Fundamenta quatit, totamque a sedibus urbem
> Eruit. Hic Juno Scæas sævissima portas
> Prima tenet, *sociumque* furens *a navibus agmen*
> Ferro accincta vocat.'

Absit omen! We will briefly sum up the result of this brief sketch of our recent ecclesiastical history.

We have seen that the Ritualists as a body are what they have been truly called, Nonconformists within the Church of England. They introduce practices into its worship which confessedly have not been in use since the time of Elizabeth. They desire to substitute for it as far as outward forms, gestures, dresses, teaching, suppressions, interpolations will allow, the worship of another Church. They speak with the utmost disparagement of the Thirty-nine Articles. They explain away the meaning of many of them to such a point as to reduce them to an absolute nullity. They set the authority of bishops as entirely at nought, as if they were Presbyterians or Independents. They abhor the union of Church and State, on which the whole of the existing constitution of the Anglican Church is founded. They belong to a party which has, in late years at least, always attempted to claim the Church for itself. They present, therefore, the extremest case which can arise to test the comprehensiveness of the National Church. To that comprehension we have already said that we think they

---

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the 'Literary Churchman,' 1865.

† Speech of Archdeacon Denison in Convocation, February 1867.

are entitled, when they do not violate the wishes and rights of their congregations. Alien as many of their tenets are to the general spirit of the Church and nation in which they have sprung up, they have still enough in common with the double-sided composite aspect of the formularies of the Church, and the character of the nation, to give them a standing-place in the eye at once of law and of charity. They supply, in some respects, a useful counterpoise to the narrowness or perverseness of other elements in the ecclesiastical world. In the earlier days of the movement they counted amongst their ranks lofty characters, and noble deeds, and persuasive works, which the English Church will not willingly let die. They now contain within their numbers (as the Bishop of London has testified) men of ardent, self-denying activity, worthy of better principles than those which they profess, and placing them thus far on a level with the equally ardent and more successful leaders of the Wesleyan movement in former times, and of those numerous clergy in our own time who need no stimulant from party-spirit or from sectarian zeal to devote themselves to the unobtrusive performance of their Master's work. And we must remember that these High Church dissenters are more amenable to the control of English law, to the softening effects of social and Christian intercourse, inside the National Church, than if they were cast out from it. By expelling them from it we should not divest ourselves of our responsibility in regard to them. We cannot burn them, as in the days of Mary; we cannot hang them, as in the days of Elizabeth; we cannot banish them, as in the days of Charles I. or Cromwell. By driving them to extremities we might perpetuate the evil for generations. If they became a separate sect, they would remain like other Nonconformists, with the additional extravagance which every isolated and exasperated sect is sure to take to itself. If they became Roman Catholics, they and their children would be parted from the national interests and national sympathies perhaps for centuries. On the other hand, if they are allowed to retain their position within the Church, the fashion would probably pass away with the present generation, and their children and grandchildren would be the staunch Puritans or Liberals of the coming age. How easily these eccentricities vanish if left to themselves, may be seen from the utter collapse of the 'Benedictines' of Brother Ignatius, towards which a summary attempt at repression might have attracted a considerable sympathy, but which, by the judicious reticence of the bishops within whose jurisdiction the strolling

friar came, sank into a wreck of rebellion, anarchy, bankruptcy, recrimination, and inextinguishable laughter.

It is not with the hope of expecting any return of tolerance at their hands, that we now plead for their toleration. We know well how forgetful this party has always been in its gratitude—how implacable in its vengeance. Not the less, however, but the more incumbent on the advocates of liberal principles is it to show that they are the first to invoke for others the liberty they claim for themselves, the last to invoke that just intervention of the law which, it may be, will be rendered necessary by the disregard of the wishes of bishops and of parishes.

But if on behalf of the general interests of the National Church, we urge political and ecclesiastical comprehension, so on behalf of the higher interests of truth we urge the need of maintaining, alike by the force of argument and by the moral weight of authority, those great principles of the Reformation, which are needed to balance the natural growth of ecclesiastical despotism, and to secure a free passage for the Church and nation through the period of transition, of which the responsibility has fallen, for good or for evil, on our age and generation. As regards the particular extravagances of Ritualism, our Bishops have, on the whole, presented a stronger front than might have been expected. We do not here speak of their joint declaration against Ritualism in the Upper House of Convocation. Like all such composite manifestoes, it is too vague to be of any real significance, and is open to many of the objections which, on a former occasion, we urged against such a course. Like all documents of which the origin is wrapt in mystery, we know not the motives, the arguments, the comparative adherence or aversion to it in individual minds, which alone can give any force, beyond that of official names, to such an act. The leading Prelates, however, have spoken in the only form in which Episcopal utterances can carry any conviction, namely, in personal individual addresses to their clergy and to the public. The Primate, in an address at once gentle and dignified, warned the party last year against the desperate course on which they were embarked. The Bishop of London has appealed to them in an entreaty, the more pathetic from the affecting circumstances under which it was written, from the unmistakable genuineness of the feeling with which he addresses them, from his cordial recognition of the better side of those whom he was conjuring, we fear in vain, to listen to a counsel, as tender in their interests, as it was wise in the interests of the Church at large. The Bishop of Oxford, in

spite of his reputed connexion with the party both in his own diocese and elsewhere, not only proposed the condemnatory manifesto to which we have alluded, but has indulged in denunciations of their practices as fervid and as elaborate as have proceeded from any of his brethren. Above all, the Bishop of St. David's has once more spoken, with that commanding judgment, solid style, and consummate learning, which overawe even those who delight to insult the Episcopate, and of which we trust that we, even when venturing to differ from the course he has sometimes chosen, have always spoken with respect. No one can read his Charge without feeling that there is at least one 'master in Israel' who surveys, if from too serene a height, yet not with an unkindly, and assuredly not with a prejudiced eye, the entanglements of his weaker brethren in the labyrinth of ecclesiastical difficulties.

But it is perhaps the chief merit of Bishop Thirlwall's powerful exhortation that it recalls us from the mere superficial grievances of the moment to those far graver perils, of which we have ourselves spoken in the preceding pages, and against which no legal or episcopal interference can avail anything, but which may be restrained by free and vigorous argument, by a higher appreciation, in statesmen and prelates, of the principles in danger. 'The brilliant fantastic coruscation' (so let us apply the ingenious metaphor used by one of the distinguished Prelates * whom we have just quoted, in a somewhat different sense than that in which he used it), the 'brilliant coruscation' of outward ceremonial may melt into air; but 'the weltering mass 'of molten metal, from which it has been cast forth, flows on 'with its full stream'—the stream of sacerdotal intolerance—withering like a lava flood every green thing within its reach, undermining and eating into the foundations of the truth and freedom of the Church. Assuredly only by maintaining its love of truth and its love of freedom can the Church resist such encroachments, not the less dangerous because they are preluded by the 'burning sparks' and 'exhalations' which serve to divert the vulgar eye from the real evil.

It is as with 'the false enchanter' in 'Comus.' The 'glass

* 'It seems to me like some brilliant fantastic coruscation, which has cast itself forth from the surface of the weltering masses of molten metal, which, unaffected by such exhalations, flows on with its full stream into its appointed mould. These burning sparks witness of the heat of the mass from which they sprung: they are not in their peculiar action, of its essence or its end.' (*Bishop of Oxford's Charge*, 1866, p. 35.)

'may be wrested out of his hand and broke against the ground,' the variegated robes may be torn by Act of Parliament or Canon of Convocation, but

> 'Ye should have snatch'd his wand.
> . . . Without his rod revers'd,
> And backward mutterings of dissevering power,
> We cannot free the lady that sits here
> In stony fetters fix'd, and motionless.'

Only by reversing the wand of pretended hierarchical power which has exercised such a magic spell over the minds and hearts of men for so many periods of the world's history, will the Church of England be really free—

> 'To climb
> High above the sphery chime.'

We must not be afraid of the famous name of Protestant. We must not be ashamed of our affinities with the Reformed Churches which claim with us a common origin in the great deliverance from a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. We must vindicate for the great old name of 'Catholic' its free, original meaning, and make it once more the watchword, not of narrow, exclusive, external observances, but of the universal breadth which it bears in the ancient creeds, and which was infused into it by the teaching of Isaiah and of St. Paul. The authority of law must again be justified as in the days of Hooker, as in the days of the Apostles; the superiority of the moral and the spiritual over the external and ceremonial parts of religion must be re-asserted, as in the days of Butler, as in the days of the Prophets. The power of the Church, that is of the laity, to control ecclesiastical matters, must be maintained as alone, in our state of society, it can be maintained, through the free expression of public opinion, and the free legislature of a free country. The clergy must maintain their right to examine for themselves the grounds of their teaching, to investigate, probe to the uttermost, the sacred volume, which by restoring new life to the world in each successive age is destined to prove anew its own divine origin. Mighty works of beneficence and enlightenment must be wrought amongst our working classes—as open to a reasonable, honest exposition of religious truth, bearing on their daily life, as they are inaccessible to the mysterious, fantastic representations of dogmas removed from all reality. The ancient institutions of England and of Christendom have resources in them still undeveloped. The Nonconformists of this country have a part to play in connexion with the Established Church, of which

they and the rulers of the Church have hardly dreamed. The Church of Scotland, the 'Samaria' of the High Church party, may, like Samaria, give to her southern sister a school of Prophets of which England, no less than Judah, is at times sorely in need. To those of our own communion who find delight in such things, we do not refuse the pleasure of indulging in the hope of an imaginary union with the Pope, who ridicules the very notion of such a fusion; or in the prospect of an assemblage of one hundred and forty-four Bishops, who are to be gathered from dioceses which can ill spare them, at enormous expense, to a meeting at Lambeth, of which its advocates are unable to say whether it is a symposium or a synod—a dinner-party or a general council. But the Prelates who encourage such schemes will vainly strive to exorcise the form of Ritualism, whilst they thus foster the worst part of its peculiar spirit. We do not deny the right of this party to fortify themselves behind the relics of older usages, which, in consideration to the infirmities of an age of transition, the Reformers left imbedded in our services,—to make the most of the fierce anathemas which condemn half Christendom, or of expressions of sacerdotal power, unknown to the ancient churches of the East, unknown to any churches at all, before the thirteenth century. But we claim for the Church of England a higher, a holier calling than any thing which these passing fancies, or isolated fragments of all but extinct beliefs would indicate. We claim for it the honour due to a Reformed Church in a Reformed State—to a Church 'which has been reformed and which never was infallible,' and which, with and through the State, desires to be formed and reformed anew by the spirit of each successive age—a Church which, however much at times it has falsified its principles and retarded the course of true Christian progress, yet in those principles contains the pledge of an onward and inward movement that will, we humbly trust, continue when both the 'brilliant fantastic coruscation' of Ritualism and the 'welter-'ing molten flood' of hierarchical pretensions, have passed away from its borders.

ART. VII.—1. *Louis XV.* Par J. MICHELET. 8vo. Paris: 1866.

2. *Mémoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV.* (1735—1758.) 17 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1860–65.

3. *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson, publiés pour la Société de l'Histoire de France.* Par J. E. B. RATHERY. 9 vols. Paris: 1859–67.

4. *Les Maîtresses de Louis XV.* Par EDMOND et JULES DE GONCOURT. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1860.

5. *Correspondance de Louis XV et du Maréchal de Noailles,* avec une introduction par M. CAMILLE ROUSSET. 2 vols. Paris: 1865.

6. *Correspondance secrète inédite de Louis XV sur la politique étrangère et autres documents.* Précédés d'une introduction par M. E. BOUTARIC. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1866.

THE age of Louis XV., although one of the saddest episodes of human history, is, nevertheless, one of great moral significance; it exemplifies the helplessness of arbitrary power to remedy the evils which it has created, the disorder and ruin which follow on the decay of moral and religious principle, the degradation which avenges the triumph of selfish and ignoble ambitions. The records of this period have been lately enriched by many new documents, which impart a graver interest to the lessons to be drawn from it. The Memoirs of the Duc de Luynes, though tediously particular about the order of court etiquette and ceremony, having been compiled and referred to as books of precedent in such matters, yet contain trustworthy journals of the daily life inside Versailles, since the Duke and Duchess de Luynes were the close friends of Maria Leczsinska, and the deserted Queen lived almost exclusively in their society. The influence of the King's daughters, and of the party of the Dauphin, is exhibited in the Duc de Luynes' pages with greater clearness than elsewhere. The correspondence of Louis XV. with the Duc de Noailles is a product of the short-lived energy which the King displayed after the death of Fleury. The correspondence taken from the secret diplomacy of the King affords a curious insight into the mind of a monarch who instituted this underhand kind of activity by way of revenging himself for his public insignificance. But the most interesting records of this reign are the Memoirs of M. d'Argenson, the most respectable of all the ministers of

Louis XV. These memoirs, written after his disgrace and the termination of a ministry of barely two years' duration, unveil more fully than ever the corruption, profligacy, and selfishness of this shameful period.* M. Michelet's volume is an eccentric and sometimes brilliant sort of overture of which the epoch of Louis XV. is the theme. This gifted and learned writer has thrown more and more mannerism into his history as he recedes from the middle ages which he had investigated with great acuteness, and moreover the period of which he now treats lacks the deep interest that pervaded his pathetic and tragic pages on the Reformation and the religious wars of France. His history of Louis XV. is unintelligible by any except those previously acquainted with the history of the time. It has in places inimitable flashes of historic perception and admirable intuitions of character, but it is a rhapsody, alike deficient in the precision of an historical narrative and the truth of historical criticism.

The reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XV. filled up a space of one hundred and thirty-one years, nearly a century and a half of the history of the French monarchy; a period which, in England, was occupied by the reigns of eight kings and queens besides a commonwealth and a dictatorship. Beneath, however, this superficial appearance of stability, the French nation was in fact undergoing a radical change. The vices of the Government had poisoned the sources of public happiness, and degraded irretrievably the national character. The splendid despotism of Louis XIV. having exhibited to modern Europe a type of post-feudal royalty of unsurpassed grandeur and magnificence, dwindled into a melancholy regime of short-

* The Marquis d'Argenson, called *la bête* at Versailles by the courtiers to distinguish him from his brother the Count, who possessed the courtier spirit in a much greater degree, is a character worth studying as a product of his time and as an example of what a mind and heart of more than average excellence might become in such an atmosphere. His principles were of the loftiest on some subjects, but on others—on marriage, for example—they were of the loosest. He was both a stoic and a voluptuary, both cosmopolitan and national, wildly utopian yet eminently practical, and had surprising intuitions of the future both in science and in politics. ' He was called by the Maréchal de Richelieu ' *Le ' Secrétaire d'État de la République de Platon.*' It is observable that he became the more utopian the further he was removed from the practice of affairs. The edition of his Mémoires by M. Rathery is by far the most accurate and complete of the three already published.

sighted ambition, intolerance, and fanaticism which emasculated the aristocracy of France, ruined her finances,* and plunged her population into the extremity of indigence and desolation. From the France of Richelieu, Colbert, and Louvois to that of the Maintenon and Chamillart, seems indeed a change greater than it could be possible for one reign to effect. The tragic celerity with which the hand of Providence had removed all the descendants of Louis XIV., gave rise to a universal suspicion of poison, and darkened the aspect of the future destinies of the country. In the last five years of that monarch's reign, the two princes on whom the hopes of the nation were centred—the Dauphin, the pupil of Bossuet, and the Duc de Bourgogne, into whose congenial spirit Fénelon had infused no small portion of his own virtues and piety—were successively struck down, and the great-grandchildren of the aged monarch were all swept away, with the exception of a boy who inherited at five years of age the responsibility of governing a great people with unlimited power.

To add still further to this inauspicious state of things, the child was subjected to a tutelage, and the Government to a Regency, of the most deplorable character. Louis XIV., with a just distrust of the vices of Philip of Orleans, who was by right of birth the Regent of the kingdom, had made provision for controlling his nephew by a council, and placing his great-grandchild under the charge of his legitimised natural son the Duke of Maine. But the testamentary dispositions of the Great Monarch shared the usual fate of such precautions; to set them aside recourse was had to the Parliament; by restoring their right of remonstrance, Philip succeeded in obtaining the annullation of the late King's will, and became sole Regent, while the Duke of Maine renounced the guardianship of the child unaccompanied with any share in the Government. The infant King was placed under the care of Fleury, then Bishop of Fréjus, whose chief aim was to win the affection and confidence of his pupil, in which he entirely succeeded; but he utterly failed to cultivate the nobler parts of his character, or to prepare him for the duties of his high position. It is impossible without indignation to think of the bright-haired boy, the darling of the people—who is said by d'Argenson to have appeared as beautiful as Eros himself at his coronation at

* At the death of Louis XIV. the public debt amounted to 789 millions; the whole revenue amounted to 165½ millions, of which only sixty-nine came into the treasury. The expenditure was 147 millions; consequently, the yearly deficit was seventy-eight millions.

Rheims—the hope of the grandest monarchy in Europe,* consigned to an instructor who would neither cultivate his mind nor discipline his character. Day by day the preceptor appeared, bringing with him toys, a cup and ball, or a pack of cards to amuse the indolent child, while it was observed that the book-marker remained in the same place for six months together in the Quintus Curtius he was reading. The companions who were provided for him were remarkable chiefly for their frivolous and effeminate precocity. The chief of these were the Dukes of Epernon and La Tremouille and de Gesvres. From one he acquired a taste for working tapestry, from another a singular proficiency in the art of cookery, which he continued to practise in the maturer years of his life; and in their society was fostered that sense of royal irresponsibility, that pride of despotism, which he expressed with his latest breath—'*Si veut le roi, si veut la loi.*' This seems to have been the sum and substance of his youthful education. The orphan child thus brought up, without a single relative to exercise upon him a humanising influence, became a silent sullen youth, pale and of feeble health. His effeminacy might have become inveterate, had not the Duc de Bourbon taken compassion on him and given him that love of hunting and field sports which has distinguished French monarchs from the days of the Merovingian kings even in their most degenerate representatives, and which became one of the young King's ruling passions, and invigorated his failing constitution. But even in his sports, one of his early exploits gives a painful impression of his character. He had a pet white doe at Versailles, at which one day he fired in mere wantonness. The poor creature came, wounded, towards him, and licked his hand; the young King drove it away from him and shot at it again and again till it died.

The Government and the Court had fallen under a worse domination than the King suffered in the tutelage of Fleury. The Regent was that Duke of Orleans of whom his mother, the stern old Princess Palatine, said that all the fairies save one had been invited to his birth, and had given him all the richest gifts of nature and intelligence, but that she who was uninvited, finding she could not take away the good gifts of her comrades, fixed upon him the incapacity of making use of them. Under the eight years' rule of Philip and his band

* That Louis XV. was extremely beautiful as a child, may be seen in the portrait at Versailles by Rigaud. In later times he was considered the handsomest man in France.

of *roués*,* Paris and Versailles became the scenes of the wildest *saturnalia* of modern times. The orgies of the masqued *bals d'opéra* were then first invented, and the *chevalier* who contrived the method of carrying a dancing-floor across the stage and pit was rewarded with 6,000 livres of pension. The courtiers who had restrained their passions by a hypocritical austerity in the last days of Louis XIV., rushed now into mad excesses to make favour with the Regent, who cynically declared that a perfect courtier should be '*sans humeur* '*et sans honneur.*' The ministers of France became the paid agents of England. The utopian schemes of Law served still further to debase the morality of court and country. The princes of the blood royal practised the arts and the cunning of the lowest money-dealers. Two national bankruptcies were declared in six years. The rigours of persecution lay heavy on those of the Huguenot and the Jansenist faith; but as if to make the dominant religion for ever contemptible, the Regent named as prime minister his former preceptor, Dubois, a shameless, cynical, blaspheming priest of sixty, whose weasel-face and bloated aspect denoted the vulgarity of his nature and a constitution vitiated by a life of low debauchery. In order to support his new dignity he was made an archbishop, and a prince of the Church: Massillon, alas! consented to preside at his consecration. This profligate ecclesiastic continued to direct the destinies of France, and was even an aspirant for the chair of St. Peter, until one day as he was reviewing the household troops with the airs of a Richelieu, and amusing the *mousquetaires* of the guard with his grotesque appearance, an abrupt movement of his horse inflicted an injury from which his diseased constitution was unable to recover. The Regent shortly after followed him to the grave; having exhausted the whole round of profligate pleasure and his own constitution, and become disgusted with life at the age of forty-eight, he made no effort to escape from death, but died like a Roman epicurean in the arms of sensual enjoyment.

It had been easy for Fleury, with the ascendancy which he exercised over the King's mind, to have secured the chief place in the government for himself; but the placid egotist desired at first a more unapparent domination without public responsibility. At his suggestion the next prince of the blood, the Duc de Bourbon, was named Regent by the young King.

The second Regency had a more lamentable influence on the young King than the first. It lasted three years. The

* So called by the Regent because *ils méritaient de l'être.*

Duc de Bourbon was as great a profligate as the late Regent, and moreover was entirely directed by a bold, brilliant, and abandoned woman the Marquise de Prie, who, by the aid of her creature Pâris Duvernai the financier, endeavoured to get the government completely in her hands and to undermine the influence of Fleury. The late Regent with all his follies had refused to permit any of his mistresses, including even his favourite, Madame de Parabère, to meddle with affairs of state; but Madame de Prie did precisely what she would with the Duke. This government is remarkable only for a renewal of the barbarous persecution of the Protestants, and for the marriage of the King, which was brought about by an intrigue of the Regent's mistress; and thus Louis XV., after a shameful education, was married by the caprice of an unprincipled woman to a wife in every respect unsuited either to his character or dignity.

Never was a royal marriage brought about under more inauspicious circumstances. The alliance which was originally planned by the Regent and Dubois with the Infanta of Spain, who was already at the French Court, was one more worthy of a king of France; and if the Court of Madrid had consented to make the husband of the Marquise de Prie a grandee of Spain, a better future might have been reserved for Louis XV. Such a demand was made of Philip V. and Elizabeth Farnese, but rejected with contempt, and the Duc de Bourbon took advantage of the disturbed relations of France and Spain to break off the Spanish marriage.

An illness of the young King frightened the Duke into precipitation. The Infanta was but six years of age, consequently would not be marriageable for several years, and if during that time Louis died without heirs, the crown would pass into the House of Orleans. It was determined to send back the Infanta, to marry the young monarch forthwith, and thus secure the succession of the crown. Madame de Prie looked round on all sides for a queen who might remain for ever bound to her by ties of gratitude and deference. After examining all the courts of Europe, two princesses alone seemed eligible, and these were resident in France. The one was Mademoiselle de Vermandois, daughter of the late Regent. In order to form a judgment of her character, Madame de Prie visited in disguise the convent in which she was being educated—and in the course of conversation brought out Mademoiselle de Vermandois's opinion of herself. The young princess spoke of the mistress of the Duc de Bourbon in such terms of indignation and aversion, that the latter departed immediately, declaring, 'She

'shall never be queen of France.' The royal crown was then destined for Maria Lecszinska, a daughter of Stanislas, the exiled King of Poland, the remaining object of her choice, who was then living in poverty with her father at Weissembourg in Alsace. The bride elect was twenty-two years of age; she had escaped by an adventurous flight with her father from Poland, in daily and hourly fear of the Russians in pursuit; her hand had already been refused as too poor a match by a colonel in the French army. In the society of her mother and father in Alsace, surrounded by a little court, she breathed the purity and simplicity of an older time. The dissolute life of Versailles, its corruption, and its elegance, were there known only by rumour; and when the unexpected intelligence of the elevation of the daughter reached the family, all three fell on their knees in silent astonishment and thanksgiving. So little adequate were their resources to provide for the contingency, that every article had to be furnished to the royal bride, even down to her linen and her gloves. The marriage took place in the chapel at Fontainebleau, on September 4th, 1725, the King being seven years younger than his wife.

Maria Lecszinska was plain, homely, matronly, and good-natured, without a trace of that coquetry of manner which had become a second nature among the court ladies of France. She would have made a good housewife for a country nobleman in Germany, but was little suited to figure even as a spectator in the brilliant saloons of Versailles. She had been brought up to habits of almost monastic piety and seclusion, and never travelled without a skull which she called her *gentil mignon*, to assist her in preserving the serious bent of her character. Between herself and her king no confidence was ever established, and the youthful possessor of the crown of the oldest monarchy in Europe saw in his mature wife a poor-spirited embarrassed matron—unequal to her queenly duties, with none of the graces or the arts he looked for in woman, and with no accomplishment capable of dissipating or beguiling his *ennui*. The favourite occupation of the Queen was to sit by the fireside in innocent and dull converse with the oldest-fashioned and most respectable people of the court, and to pass her evening in monotonous games of *cavagnole*. Artful intriguers, moreover, suggested to her to adopt precisely the line of conduct calculated to widen the distance between herself and her husband, and her restless old-maidenish habits so irritated the impressionable monarch that he often quitted her in the middle of the night with disgust and vexation. Though the King was faithful to her for nine years, he ex-

claimed ironically before his court—'*Est-elle plus belle que la 'reine?*' when a pretty woman was mentioned. During this period the Queen became the mother of two sons and several daughters,* but, arrived at the age of twenty-five, he commenced that series of adulterous alliances and shameful amours in which he persisted for the remaining forty years of his life. The Queen bore the sorrows and trials of her deserted position with exemplary patience; though cruelly compelled to admit the King's mistresses to her presence as her maids of honour, and to give them a position at Versailles, she seldom murmured a complaint, except that when she was reduced to receive the Pompadour as an attendant, she exclaimed, '*J'ai un 'Roi dans le ciel pour m'écouter, et un roi sur la terre auquel 'j'obéirai toujours.*'

The only faint attempt which she ever made to gain political influence was soon after her marriage. Feeling that her elevation was the work of the Duke and Madame de Prie, she obeyed their suggestions in endeavouring to procure the dismissal of Fleury; but the scheme turned against the contrivers; the King refused to break with his old preceptor; and the latter, aware of the plot, insisted, before he would assent to retain office, on the exile of his enemies. Louis, with the dissimulation which was his habit through life, towards those with whom he was about to break for ever, said to the Duke, with a more than usually gracious smile, '*Mon cousin, 'ne me faites pas attendre pour souper,*' and a few hours later commanded him, by a curt letter, to betake himself to Chantilly till further notice. Madame de Prie was exiled to Normandy, where, unable to appease her rage or console her deceived ambition after a life of unparalleled splendour and extravagance, she took deadly poison and died in excruciating agonies, with shrieks which were heard far beyond the walls of her château.

Fleury, at seventy-three years of age, assumed the position of prime minister; he held it for seventeen years, until his death at eighty-nine; and thus his rule was nearly as long as that of Richelieu or Mazarin. The ascendancy of this bland octogenarian for so long a period over the spirit of a youthful monarch, is one of the strangest anomalies of history. M. Michelet, who loves such suggestions, endeavours to ac-

* When the seventh daughter was born the King was asked if she should be called *Madame la Septième;* he replied, '*Madame la 'Dernière.*' The birth of this princess was an immense disappointment, as the King, Court, and people had made up their minds that a Duc d'Anjou was to be given to the country.

count for it by insinuations of early vices of the King and his young companions — which recall the court of the last Valois — vices, the knowledge of which gave the preceptor complete power over his former pupil. In support of such explanation, he relies on the statement of a *valet de chambre* that the King was bound to Fleury as long as he lived.* Be this as it may, Fleury managed the government as he had managed the education of the King. Without a policy of any kind, without pride, and without honour, he would submit to any humiliation, and practise any meanness in order to secure a quiet domination. He depended upon economy, or rather parsimony, for securing a quiet government at home; during his administration the army went to pieces for want of pay, and the ships rotted in the harbours for want of repairs, while he relieved pecuniary difficulties on taking office by decreeing another partial bankruptcy.

The Spanish difficulty occasioned by the dismissal of the Infanta was smoothed over, but the Polish and Austrian successions were both questions pregnant with war for all Europe. The Polish question was the first to start up on the death of Augustus II. Austria and Russia supported the pretensions of Augustus III. son of the late monarch. France supported the rights of Stanislas the father-in-law of Louis XV. Fleury, however, gave no energetic support to the French policy, in order to do which it would have been necessary to send a French fleet to the Baltic and secure the possession of Dantzig, where Stanislas had fixed his quarters; but this was an act of vigour beyond the capacity of Fleury. A small detachment of French which accompanied the Polish king, was defeated and taken prisoners at Dantzig by the Russians, after a heroic resistance.† Poland was lost. But the old generals Villars and Berwick—the last relics of the military glory of Louis XIV.—inspired by Chauvelin, the only minister capable of conceiving a large scheme of policy which might unite in a confederative system the chaos of small disjointed

* Of the modesty of Fleury, the following anecdote is sufficiently illustrative. He found the King on one occasion reading the 'Économies Royales' of Sully, and taking the book, pointed out to the Monarch the passage in which Henry IV. is made to say (to his mistress Gabrielle):—'*Je trouverais dans mon royaume deux cent 'maîtresses aussi belles que vous, mais je n'y trouverais pas deux 'hommes comme Sully: aussi soyez persuadée qu'entre vous deux 'j'opterais pour lui.*' (*D'Argenson*, vol. ii. p. 362.)

† This affair is remarkable as being the first occasion on which French and Russian soldiers met in conflict.

states which then chequered the surface of Europe, urged the aged minister to exact compensation from Austria in Italy. The plan of Chauvelin was to drive the Austrians from Italy; his laudable ambition was that France should have the honour of restoring to the Peninsula that independence which she had been the first to assail by the invasion of Charles VIII. Fleury was unable to withstand the warlike passions which beset him. Negotiations were set on foot; Spain and Piedmont entered into the plans of Chauvelin. The Milanese was to be added to Piedmont, and Parma, Tuscany, Naples, and Sicily were to be independent under Spanish princes.* A triple declaration of war was launched in October 1733, and two French armies under Villars and Berwick crossed the Alps and the Rhine, where at Philipsburg Berwick was to find himself opposed by his former adversary Prince Eugene. The war, conducted without energy on either side, was chiefly remarkable for having carried off Villars and Berwick; Berwick was killed by a cannon-shot at Philipsburg, to the envy of Villars,† who always desired such an end, and who, disgusted at the conduct of the war, withdrew from it, and died five days after Berwick in his bed, worn out by the fatigue of the campaign in Lombardy. His chivalrous courage was true to itself to the last, for in his eighty-second year, finding himself in danger of being surrounded in company with the King of Sardinia, he charged the enemies sword in hand and extricated himself and his royal companion. After languishing for two years, the war was terminated by a treaty between the Cabinets of France and Vienna; none of the objects of Chauvelin's policy were achieved, but the minister even in the defeat of his projects managed to secure one solid advantage for France—her last great and permanent accession of territory—the acquisition of Lorraine. Lorraine, a feudal dependency of the Empire, was, in consideration of the reversion of Tuscany being settled on Francis of Lorraine, the affianced husband of Maria Theresa, ceded for ever to France with a provision that Stanislas should enjoy the sovereignty for his lifetime as an indemnification for the lost crown of Poland. The inhabitants of Lorraine regarded with regret their severance from the

* One clause of the treaty of France with Sardinia was, that Savoy should be given up to France if Mantua were taken from the Austrians.

† Villars, when he heard of Berwick's fall on his own death-bed, cried, '*Il y a toujours été plus heureux que moi, ce coquin-là.*'

ancient dynasty, which had ruled their little principality for eight centuries, and was as old as the House of the Capets. The ultimate advantage was, however, undoubtedly great both for Lorraine and for France. After the cession was accomplished, the superiority of Chauvelin in the cabinet became intolerable to the mediocre genius of Fleury, and he was exiled to his country-house by a *lettre de cachet.* The conduct of the King was as contemptible as it always was in similar circumstances. He himself had sense enough to appreciate the merit of Chauvelin, and some of his most familiar courtiers attempted to defend the minister and to persuade the King not to dismiss the most capable adviser he had about him. He promised them not to betray their advocacy to Fleury; but in this, as in all like conjunctures, he broke his word and denounced his companions to the Cardinal, and the Duc de la Tremouille declared that he remained the servant but not the friend of Louis. Chauvelin, however, notwithstanding his disgrace, always had one powerful and important friend at Court—Bachelier, the King's valet, whom his master consulted, not only about his mistresses, but also about matters of State.

Such was the only result of the foreign policy of Fleury. Internally commerce was prosperous, and the towns increased in magnitude, while the country populations were devoured by poverty of the most frightful intensity. The eternal war about the Bull Unigenitus carried on by the Ultramontanes and Jesuits against the Jansenists and the Parliament still continued, and its intensity was typified by the strange manifestations of the *convulsionnaires* and the so-called miracles performed at the tomb of the Diâcre Paris. But the Court and society under the domination of a minister of eighty, and with a young king who up to that time had shown no tastes for any of the pleasures of intelligence or imagination and no passion for anything but gambling and field sports,* had fallen into a state of dullness and monotony intolerable to those who knew even by tradition the elegance and majesty of the Court of Louis XIV., and who had been spectators of the wild extravagance and brilliant spectacles of the Court of the Regent and of Madame de Prie. Weary of the gloom and desolation of the saloons of the vast palace and of the domestic monotony of the King's life, all Versailles entered into a conspiracy to give the King a mistress, for this seemed the most natural and ready way of effecting a change. The chief contrivers of the

* According to the Duc de Luynes, the King killed 3,000 stags in the course of seventeen years' hunting.

plot were Mademoiselle de Charolais,* a great-granddaughter of the great Condé and a daughter of the Duc de Bourbon, and M. de Richelieu,† whose name has become proverbial as the most complete personification of all the heartless and frivolous vices of the time, and who extended his pernicious influence throughout the whole of the long reign of Louis.

The Duc de Richelieu was in every respect the spoiled child of the monarchy and of the court. When he was baptised at three years of age he was held at the font by Louis XIV. and the pious princess the Duchess de Bourgogne; he was the little favourite of the Great King and Madame de Maintenon in those days of austere piety. Under the Regency, however, he began to appear in his true character, and his frivolity, taste for intrigue, unscrupulous gallantry and immorality, without shame and without remorse, were such as to disgust even the Regent. He was reckless both as a gambler and a duellist, and was once run through the body. He was Seduction personified, and it became a fashion among the ladies of the Court to treat him as irresistible. Princesses of the blood contended for his good graces; and when in consequence of an audacious intrigue he was committed to the Bastille for fourteen months, Mademoiselle de Valois, the daughter of the Regent, and Mademoiselle de Charolais, suppressed their jealousy and waited on him by turns in disguise. Mademoiselle de Valois consented even to accept a marriage she detested and to exile herself from France to

* Mademoiselle de Charolais was a constant participator in the orgies of the King. She made her house at Madrid in the Bois de Boulogne a place of *rendezvous* for the monarch and his mistresses; she was always in the search of a new royal mistress when occasion required who might prevent the King from falling back into what she styled his stupid *bourgeois* life previous to his *liaison* with Madame de Mailly. The Comte de Charolais, the most violent character of his time, was her brother. He committed several assassinations in mere wantonness, and it was he who shot down tilers from the roof like pigeons. On one occasion he prevented his trial by asking for pardon before an accusation. The King said, 'Granted, this time; but the next, if you are assassinated yourself, 'the assassin's pardon is already signed.'

† It is a singular coincidence that Voltaire and the Duc de Richelieu, who were both such representatives of their epoch, began life within two years of each other; that both attained to unusual longevity in spite of original weak health and such restless lives, in the one case of intellectual toil, in the other of dissipation. Voltaire was born in 1694, Richelieu in 1696. The first died in 1778, the latter in 1784; attaining respectively the ages of eighty-four and ninety-two.

secure his liberation. While he was in the Bastille the ladies of the Court would collect in crowds on the *glacis* to have the opportunity of seeing Richelieu take his daily walk with his cane on the ramparts magnificently attired, curled, ruffled, and be-ribboned. After his release two great ladies, Mesdames de Nesle and de Polignac, fought a duel for him in the Bois de Boulogne, after which he was again sent to the Bastille. To add to the singularity of his character, when employed in diplomacy or in war, he always disappointed his enemies by coming out of his difficulties with success. Madame de Pompadour had the command of the expedition to Minorca entrusted to him, hoping that ill success would be his ruin, but he took the island. His embassy to Vienna ruined his private but retrieved his public fortune. He married a second time a princess of the House of Lorraine. His pernicious libertine influence was powerful with Louis during the whole of his reign, and he was present at his death-bed making game of the last rites of religion, asking the Archbishop of Paris not to kill the King with a theological proposition, and offering to confess in the King's stead many a *joli petit pêché mignon* which would be equally entertaining.

The nation itself, as well as Versailles, was weary of the improvident parsimony of Fleury, who was content with living on from day to day without thought of the future, and felt equal disgust with Mademoiselle de Charolais and the Court at the domestic platitude of the King's life; and dreamed of a mistress who might perchance be the means of rousing the monarch into activity. Fleury himself was not averse to the King's taking to himself a mistress, but with different views from those of the Court and nation; for he hoped that her influence would still further absorb the King's attention and leave him still more free in the management of affairs. The establishment of a royal favourite having been thus encouraged on all sides, expectation was on tiptoe, till it was repeated from lip to lip that at a supper-party Louis had broken his glass after a toast to the *Belle Inconnue*, and invited his companions to follow his example. From this time a total change took place in the air and manners of the King; his sad and listless youth broke out into fast and furious gaiety, and astonished the whole Court. He hunted more wildly, drank more deeply, supped more furiously, astonished Paris by his appearance at an opera ball, and exclaimed of the Queen, as he returned from her after a cold reception, when he had approached her reeling under the influence of champagne, that he would keep himself free of his wife for the rest of his life.

The *Belle Inconnue*, whom the King had toasted, was Madame de Mailly. She came of the noble family of the Nesles, who dated from the eleventh century. Her father, a cynical witty *roué*, had dissipated his vast fortune in the orgies of the Regency, and trailed in the dust the honour of one of the noblest families in France. His creditors had seized everything, and it was said he was reduced to cook his own *pot au feu* in an earthen vessel. His eldest daughter had married her cousin the Comte de Mailly, and they were spoken of as keeping house on hunger and thirst. Madame de Mailly was a lean *brune*, of thirty years of age. Though by no means a beauty, her large dark Juno-like eyes, over-arched by thick eyebrows, were capable of lighting up wildly with passion, and the meagre oval of her face grew brilliant with excitement. Her bold bearing, her superb and reckless graces, her loose yet exquisite style of dress, partaking of all the freedom of the Regency, gave her a Bacchanalian air full of seduction. Yet it was not her charms alone or her frailty, which induced the conspirators to select her as their instrument; her thoughtless and unselfish spirit, her incapacity for intrigue, and her ignorance of all serious matters were apparent enough to satisfy the courtiers that she would be sufficiently docile in the hands of those who might give her a royal lover.

Madame de Mailly seems to have loved the King as sincerely and unselfishly as was compatible with such a passion; and of all the mistresses of Louis XV. she alone never abused her influence. Although extremely embarrassed in money matters, she asked for no relief from the King, whose purse was very meagrely furnished by the Cardinal; and at a playful insinuation thrown out by Louis at a supper-party that she had accepted presents to intercede for his favour, she would not rest till she had gained the assurance of all present that the story was a pure invention. With her accession now began the King's lifelong course of supper-parties after the fatigues of the chase in the cabinets of Versailles; those royal debauches, which drank and feasted away the glory and the greatness of the royalty, for which Moutier, the famous cook of the Regency, prepared the most exquisite and highly-spiced viands, where Mademoiselle de Charolais mixed the salads and the *entremets de truffes* under the eyes of the King, and where he himself sometimes cooked *ragoûts* in stewpans of silver with the assistance of the Prince de Dombes; and at which not unfrequently all decency was laid aside and the whole party drank themselves under the table, and were carried to their beds at daybreak.

A secret *liaison* did not suit the plans of those who had prepared the seduction of the King; they were determined that the monarch should commit himself openly to scandal and a new life. Bachelier, the royal valet, the vizier of the *petits appartements* of Louis XV., was a prime agent in this as in all the other private amusements of the King, and seconded the general desire; as he led a hooded lady one night through the antechamber towards his master's cabinet, he drew back the hood and showed to the assembled court the features of the Comtesse de Mailly.

The intimacy of the King with Madame de Mailly was not however calculated to last long. Her comparative plainness among the beauties of Versailles, and her mature age, were fruitful subjects of raillery among the courtiers. Madame de Mailly herself, with a restless spirit of *taquinerie* and jealousy, failed not to increase the monarch's weariness. Her undivided reign lasted for six years, when she was supplanted in the King's affections by her next sister, Felicité de Nesle, whose wild and ambitious spirit had formed in the solitude of a convent the heartless and deliberate scheme which she carried into effect. In the austere recesses of that abode she had in the letters of her sister studied and divined the King's character, his weakness, his *ennui*, and his pliability to female dominion. Day by day with infantine cajolery she besought Madame de Mailly to remove her from the gloom of seclusion to the brilliant life of Versailles. She appeared at court. Though she had less beauty even than Madame de Mailly, she surpassed her in intelligence, and her wild imagination and her versatile humours rapidly subjugated the royal fancy; while Madame de Mailly was sufficiently humble to accept her sister as an associate in the royal amours to preserve the title of reigning mistress. The scandal of this incestuous arrangement was made patent on the 5th of April, 1739, when the King, who had ever the fear of eternal punishment before his eyes, and shuddered at the notion of receiving the sacred wafer in a state of mortal sin, lest divine judgment and sudden death should fall upon him, declared he would not take the sacrament at Easter, '*qu'il ne ferait pas ses Pâques;*' and consequently would not touch for the king's evil. The amazement of Paris was great; and Barbier naïvely asks how it was that the eldest son of the Church could not get a dispense from the Pope *to take the sacrament in any case.** Shortly after, on the 29th of September,

* The Jesuit Lémeri, the King's confessor, suggested that the King might *communier en blanc;* that is, pretend to take the sacra-

an accommodating husband, the Comte de Vintimille, nephew to the Archbishop of Paris, was found for Mademoiselle de Nesle. His uncle the Archbishop officiated at this mock ceremony; the lady was married with a dowry from the King; and on the night of the marriage the King did M. de Vintimille the honour of handing him the '*chemise*.' M. de Vintimille was, as might be expected, a reckless, shameless, cynical profligate. On one occasion he called out so that the King could overhear him, '*Après tout, il n'a que deux laides*,' and D'Argenson reports a shameful speech of his on the occasion of his wife's *accouchement*.

Madame de Vintimille was by no means inclined to follow her sister's example and abstain from meddling with politics, and this the more that events of immense importance occurred in Europe immediately after her establishment at Versailles—events which changed the balance of power in Europe, and which have in our own day acquired a new significance through the extraordinary revolution which has occurred in the distribution of Continental power in the past year. Frederic II. became King of Prussia on the 31st of May, 1740, and the great House of Hapsburg came to an end in the male line by the death of the Emperor Charles VI., who died on the 20th of October in the same year, carried off prematurely at the age of fifty-five. Maria Theresa at the age of twenty-three had to settle the fatal question of the Austrian succession with the crowd of royal pretenders, each ravenous for some share of the vast heritage which Charles had left behind him.

Pascal has said that the history of the world would have been different had the nose of Cleopatra been shorter. It would be well for philosophers of history to consider what might be the present state of Europe if Madame de Vintimille's nose had been subject to Pascal's hypothesis; for in 1740, as in 1756, and as in 1866, the momentous question was placed before France, what attitude she should assume between the rival pretensions of Austria and Prussia? It is only now that the immense magnitude of the question which presented itself to the Cabinet of Versailles in 1740 is really apparent; for had France at that crisis firmly opposed the policy of Prussia, Frederic had never ventured on the invasion of Silesia, the aggrandisement of Prussia would have been checked at its outset, and the partition of Poland

---

ment with an *unconsecrated wafer*, to save appearances. It is proper to say that he was exiled for the suggestion.

prevented. It was Madame de Vintimille who decided the King, in spite of the reluctance of Fleury, whose sympathies were all Austrian, to throw the whole weight of the French monarchy on the side of Prussia; and thus Madame de Vintimille was a link in the chain of events which has ended in the battle of Sadowa.

There was the less excuse for the part which France took on this occasion, as not only was its Government, in common with all the Governments of Europe, bound by treaty to support the Pragmatic Sanction and the succession of Maria Theresa to the undivided heritage of the House of Austria, but France had, moreover, incurred especial obligations by accepting the transfer of the imperial claims upon Lorraine. There were, however, treaties of an opposite tendency between France and Bavaria, the ancient and unfortunate ally of Louis XIV., which clashed with this arrangement, and the Government was pledged to support the candidature of the Elector of Bavaria for the German Empire; nevertheless the assistance of France was still courted on all sides, and by a timely attempt at an equitable adjustment of rival claims she might have secured the peace of Europe and altered its future destiny. But all the advantages of her advantageous position were improvidently sacrificed, the sanctity of treaties was treated with contempt, her recklessness and wilfulness rendered her the sport of Prussian ambition, as she assisted, with all the vacillation of weakness, in the dismemberment of Austria and her own political abasement.*

There still remained a party in France who adhered to the traditional policy of Richelieu, and insisted, in spite of the changed condition of Europe, that the humiliation of Austria should continue to be the proper aim of French continental policy. Of these the Comte de Belleisle, a minister and a general of great enterprise and of considerable ability, was the chief spirit; and he it was who gained the ear of Madame de Vintimille and persuaded her that to commit the King to an anti-Austrian policy would be the most efficient means of maintaining her own influence and upsetting the influence of Fleury. Beset on the one side by this party, and dissuaded on the other by the remonstrances of Fleury, the King for some time remained

* The European situations of 1740 and 1866 are more similar for another reason. Then, as now, Prussia had made immense advances in military organisation and discipline, which no European State had the foresight to keep pace with. Prince Eugene assured Charles VI. that an army of 200,000 men would be worth more than all the European guarantees to his Pragmatic Sanction.

in a state of apathy and indecision, until Frederic himself cast the fatal die and threw his troops into Silesia. At this time also the King's daughter, the Infanta, wife of the second son of the King of Spain, assailed her father with letters clamorous for a portion of the spoil of Austria in the shape of a royal appanage for her husband, to be carved out of the Milanese. When Frederic gained the battle of Molwitz, the war party in France redoubled their energies; the King's mistresses and his daughter became more and more urgent; Louis became more and more disposed to yield; Fleury, fearing to lose his much-cherished ascendancy, renounced at last all opposition; and the Comte de Belleisle, who had gone on an embassy to Germany, was made Maréchal of France, and his errand changed from a mission of peace to one of war and spoliation.

Two French armies—one destined to support the Elector of Bavaria, another directed upon Westphalia—crossed the Rhine, and overwhelmed Maria Theresa with astonishment, but inspired her with desperate energy. As between Frederic and his abettors in this shameful violation of faith and the law of nations, the Prussian King was the more excusable of the two, inasmuch as with the eye of genius he saw that the fate of Prussia, with her ragged strips of territory extending from the frontier of Russia to the Rhine, must be to devour, or in time to be devoured, and with a ruler of his unscrupulous character there could be little hesitation as to the alternative. The support which he received from the French Government was of a wavering character devoid of all energy. Frederic was extremely discontented with the inefficiency of their co-operation, and the author of the anti-Machiavel, with true Machiavellian policy, drew off from or made use of the French alliance precisely as his chance of a permanent peace with Austria with the retention of his Silesian spoils seemed more or less probable. During one of these temporary desertions of Frederic from the French alliance, a French army was shut up in Prague, but succeeded in effecting its escape in the depth of winter. The severity of the frost, the hardships endured, and the number of soldiers who perished on the road, made this retreat similar on a small scale to the retreat of the French army from Moscow.*

With our Hanoverian dynasty it was not possible that England should long remain a spectator of the Continental

* This retreat is memorable from having been the cause of the premature decline of Vauvenargues, one of the most interesting characters of the eighteenth century. He never recovered from the sufferings he then underwent.

war, and all Europe took part in the conflict. After torrents of blood had been shed, the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was concluded in 1748—a treaty from which no European Power derived any advantage with the exception of Prussia, who secured Silesia, and England, who established her maritime supremacy on the ruin of that of France. The armies and resources of France were used up in an unjust and ill-conducted contest carried on chiefly in Flanders and Italy.

The superiority which the French had maintained from the time of Vauban in the art of sieges and in engineering could nowhere be more advantageously exhibited than in Flanders; and this kind of military operations diverted the King without requiring too much energy or exertion. Fleury died in the beginning of 1743,* after having, by his querulous complaints to Maria Theresa against the warlike tendencies of his own plenipotentiary in Germany, exposed the Cabinet of Versailles to the laughter of Europe. The French failed in every other quarter but in Flanders; there too they lost the battle of Dettingen, and their operations were conducted with signal unsuccess by the Maréchal de Noailles, until this commander had the magnanimity to recognise the superiority of Maurice of Saxony, under whose guidance the French obtained the victories of Fontenoy, Raucoux, and Lawfeld—victories which, however, Frederic said were as useless to him as victories on the banks of the Scamander, or as the taking of Pekin.

The two or three years before and after the battle of Fontenoy form the most brilliant part of the reign of Louis XV. After the death of Fleury, under the counsels of the Maréchal de Noailles, and inspired by Madame de Châteauroux, he for a short time made an effort to enact the part of Louis XIV. He acquainted himself with the affairs of his kingdom, and studied the general condition of Europe. It was during this period that the Marquis d'Argenson was called to the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs; he was a pupil of Chauvelin; his plan was to convert a war unjust in its commencement into one which should establish the equilibrium of Europe on juster and more stable conditions. With some modifications he pursued Chauvelin's projects for rendering Italy independent, to which he added a scheme for the settlement of

* The Cardinal gave himself youthful airs up to the last, and with such effect that he deceived the populace of Paris whenever he appeared before them. '*Hélas!*' they cried, '*voilà un vieillard* '*qui se porte bien; il est bien vif, et durera longtemps; il nous fera* '*longtemps manger le pain bien cher.*'

the kingdom of Poland on a secure basis. These plans, however, failed from want of proper support and the opposition of the King's own family. D'Argenson, who began to oppress the indolent monarch with the superiority of his talents and his character, and was liable to some just suspicion on account of his utopian views, was permanently dismissed. The nation had at one time begun to hope that the King had awakened in Louis, but they were speedily undeceived, and on the elevation of Madame de Pompadour they lost all hopes of his improvement. The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle excited universal discontent; the very women of the *halles* cried '*Bête comme la paix;*' and the popular contempt of the King was increased subsequently by the ignoble manner in which the hospitality of the realm and his own pledged word were violated by the seizure of the Young Pretender at the Opera-house and his deportation from a country which had engaged to support his cause and which had encouraged and assisted him to make his unfortunate attempt of 1745 to regain the crown of his ancestors.

The private and public life of Louis were so mixed up together that it is impossible to view them apart, for the events and intrigues of the bed-chamber governed the march of armies and directed the discharge of their artillery. Madame de Vintimille, who admitted even a third sister, Madame de Laraguais, to a participation in the family fortune, died of a miliary fever in the full height of her favour and in the midst of her dreams of political empire, leaving a son who grew up the precise image of his father. The King showed more sensibility on this occasion than on any other of his life, and remained for some days in complete privacy; the effect of the sudden death of his mistress not only affected him with passionate grief, but renewed in him the dread of hell torment which tortured him to the end of his days on similar occasions. The share which Madame de Mailly took in the King's affliction brought back some semblance of his former affection. But that consummate tempter the Duc de Richelieu was on the look-out for another *liaison* for his sovereign. That which existed between Madame de Mailly and the King had never been congenial to his own tastes, since Madame de Mailly had adopted the counsels and the resentments of her friend the Princesse de Charolais, who herself had had too intimate an acquaintance with the unprincipled nature of the heartless libertine.

The Duke consequently determined to give his sovereign a new mistress who should owe everything to himself and be more capable of exercising political influence over the King.

He took Madame de Tencin, an ancient favourite of the Regent, into his confidence, and the two together discussed the whole range of Court beauties, weighed the character and docility of each, and calculated the probable duration of her reign. Their choice after much hesitation fixed itself upon another Nesle, the youngest of all the sisters of Madame de Mailly, superior to all the rest in beauty, possessing an abundant portion of the family brilliance, with intelligence and ambition, and prepared by the selfishness of her heart and the unscrupulousness of her conscience to make a pitiless use of her advantages.

The name of the lady was Madame de la Tournelle, now better known in history as the Duchess of Châteauroux. Her charms had already made a great impression on the King, who had seen her on a visit to the Duc d'Antin, and exclaimed '*Mon Dieu! qu'elle est belle!*' Her beauty was of a different character from that of her sisters. Her skin was of a dazzling whiteness, and her large blue eyes had a magic and fascinating brilliance; her form was not spare but graceful, and her lips fine and full; her smile was bright at once with infantine freshness and coquettish malice, while her bearing had all the lightness, and her manners all the dash, which distinguished the rest of the Nesles. But her temper was widely different from that of her sisters, and the Duc de Richelieu had considerable difficulty in getting the King to play the lover in such fashion as would suit the pride of the imperious Madame de la Tournelle. The lady was willing enough to accept the position, but she was not willing to be a humble partner in the royal amours or to make such advances as Madame de Mailly had made before her. She required to be courted, to have the advances made to her in a manner satisfactory to her pride and her ambition, and to reign absolutely. The difficulty of Richelieu was to get the King, indolent, shy, and apprehensive of all effort—a King accustomed to be served in love as in all else—to speak the language of devotion, and to give himself the trouble to please a high-spirited woman with all the caprice of beauty and who determined to uphold her dignity even as mistress. Her first condition was the dismissal of Madame de Mailly. The anguish, the tears, the supplications of her sister availed nothing, and she succeeded in her purpose with stipulations of inflexible severity. After this she consented to receive a first declaration in her apartment of lady-in-waiting to the Queen at Versailles at dead of night; the King and Richelieu betook themselves to the rendezvous disguised in the large perruques of doctors of the time. The King came away from

the interview more impassioned than before, and the reign of Madame de la Tournelle, soon after created Duchess of Châteauroux, commenced. Madame de Mailly, even after her departure from Versailles, made one more effort to recover her position. She asked and obtained a last interview with the monarch she had loved; and the courtiers saw the discarded mistress come from the royal closet with heaving bosom, with eyes full of tears, and in a state of desolation which made her insensible to all about her. Behind her came the King, affecting a few parting words of heartless consolation, and speaking the last words she was destined to hear from him; the cruel dissimulation which was so characteristic of his nature never found a more striking utterance—'*À lundi, à Choisy, madame la* '*comtesse . . . à lundi, j'espère que vous ne me ferez pas at-*' *tendre.*' At Choisy, on Monday, the unhappy woman knew the sister who supplanted her was to take possession of the doubtful honours of reigning mistress.

But the arts of coquetry and indifference of Madame de la Tournelle were not yet exhausted. Before she yielded she irritated the King's passion almost to fury. She had many enemies in the palace, the chief of whom, Maurepas, used every intrigue to oppose the rise of the new favourite —a favourite with whom he saw he should have to reckon as with a new power. With consummate skill, and with the aid of Richelieu as prime minister, who was called the president of Madame de la Tournelle, she triumphed over all her opponents, and exacted for the journey to the King's new château of Choisy, in the vicinity of Marly, an unprecedented display of the power of a mistress. She stipulated that her retinue should consist of the most noble names of France. One princess of the blood royal, Mademoiselle de la Roche sur Yon, formed part in her train, and the presence of the virtuous Duchess de Luynes was requested by Louis in person of the Duke de Luynes. The Duke made a profound inclination, but immediately after addressed himself to one of the gentlemen of the chamber, and begged him to ask the King to accept his regrets and his excuses.

With this *liaison* a new life commenced for Louis XV. He now defied publicity and gave loose to his appetites and his senses with all the freshness to be looked for in a young man suddenly liberated from the rule of a ministerial pedagogue. Indifferent to France, her victories and her defeats, he hunted and drank and feasted as though that were the real business of his life, and his royalty were a mere pageant. The arrival of a trout from the lake of Geneva, or a loose bit of scandal from

the Duke of Richelieu, drove out of his head all care for the provinces or the army, and he was wholly absorbed in his new passion and in voluptuous delights, when his soldiers were making the disastrous retreat from Prague, and sinking with frost and hunger on the route. Thousands were lying as corpses beneath the snows of Germany whilst he was living in his little Court of Choisy, in the midst of a world of charming and unscrupulous women and of gay, polished, and dissolute *bons viveurs*,—whilst every morning after rising he made what was called *la ronde du Roi*, passing from room to room and stopping by the side of the laced pillows of the sleepers to awaken the ladies in waiting on his mistress.

The reign of Madame de Châteauroux was brilliant, short, eventful, and tragic. It began in December 1742, and lasted precisely two years. The new mistress, described by Madame de Tencin as '*haute comme les monts*,' had that loftiness of nature which sometimes appears striking even in the ruins of all moral principle. She united the pride and passion of a Montespan to the energy and ambition of a Longueville. The *salons* of Versailles were too limited a theatre for her energies, and she burned with the desire of becoming the Agnes Sorel of the indolent monarch and making her position pardonable in the eyes of patriotism; all the King's advisers who were distinguished by any energy of private or patriotic ambition found a ready listener in Madame de Châteauroux.

After allowing the King to revel for a while in his new passion, and after having obtained her duchy and taken her *tabouret* before the Queen, the lady entered with ardour into her political part. With the apathetic King politics had hitherto been a game of cup and ball, which he played in the presence of his ministers. To talk reason to him, it was said, was to talk to a stone, and the influence of an energetic mistress might perhaps arouse the monarch from his torpor. Madame de Châteauroux began to attack the feeble nature of the King, to endeavour to rouse him to some sense of duty, and to overwhelm him with suggestions about his ministers, about his Parliament, about the war, about its bad management, and the condition of the people and the country. She spoke to him of the humiliations of France, of the disaster of Prague, of the ill success of Bavaria, of generals without genius, of soldiers without confidence, of France isolated and her frontiers threatened. One measure she urged upon him before all—to put himself at the head of his armies. The conscience of the *fainéant* king writhed at length beneath the grasp of the imperious woman. '*Vous me tuez*,' he cried, when

brought to bay by a crowd of arguments and persecuted with the display of her great conceptions. '*Tant mieux, sire,*' the mistress replied, '*il faut qu'un roi ressuscite.*'

Other court intrigues contributed at the same time to favour the views of Madame Châteauroux. Maurepas the *chansonnier*, the light frivolous minister whose name is associated with the disgrace of one and the disasters of two reigns, the Maréchal de Noailles, Richelieu, as well as all the courtiers who worshipped the star of the mistress, endeavoured to get the King to take the field. Pure patriotism had little to do with any of their persuasions. Maurepas reckoned upon getting the King to determine to join the army through the influence of the favourite, and by a fine touch of subtlety trusted also subsequently to persuade the King not to take his mistress with him; he then hoped, since he himself would necessarily accompany his sovereign, to disengage him from any influence but his own. The Maréchale de Noailles, the old Duchess—now ninety-nine years of age, the mother of eleven daughters and ten sons, with more than a hundred living descendants—she whom the courtiers called the mother of the ten tribes of Israel, all anxiously looking to the Duchess and the King's favour to provide them with a new land of promise; she with all the tribe of the Noailles, in fact, were calculating on the good things to be got if the King could be carried off to the camp of the Marshal, where the latter would have uncontrolled supervision of the despatch-boxes from Paris. Thus the King was, after long preparation, wound up to the pitch of resolve, and determined to join the army. Maurepas insinuated at the last moment that if Louis XV. would really play a kingly part, and gain the affection of his people, he must make one more sacrifice, and leave his mistresses at home. On this question there ensued a subtle game of intrigue, but in the end Maurepas triumphed; the tears of the favourite were vain, and the King departed alone, on the 2nd of May, 1744.

The King reached the army, and all France burst out into hymns of praise. The King had visited the fortresses, the stores at the hospitals; he had tasted the broth of the sick and the bread of the soldiers. He was busy and observant; wherever his presence was needed there he was found. He was accessible to officers of all rank. People repeated his reply to the Dutch ambassador, '*Je vous ferai réponse en Flandre.*' Confidence was restored in the army, in the country. Men said to each other, 'Now we have a King again,' and repeated, '*Et surtout il n'est pas question de femmes.*' Suddenly, however,

the popular enthusiasm fell fifty degrees; the common soldiers grinned about the tent of the King, whence two splendid ladies in patches and rouge and magnificent attire were often seen to emerge to their carriage; ladies to whom very rough opprobious names were given, and concerning whom scornful and satirical *chansons* were bandied about the camp. A murmur of indignation ran through France; the hopes of the nation were deceived.

Madame de Châteauroux had rejoined the King at Lille. With her came also Madame de Laraguais and a bevy of court ladies. The two sisters followed in the King's wake without any concealment, while the *grand maréchal des logis* preceded them, to prepare the communication between the King's lodgings and those of his mistresses. Then ensued the most striking incident of the latter days of royalty in France, when the sudden and nearly fatal illness of the King at Metz, aroused for the last time the deep-seated affection of the nation for its Sovereign, one final expression of loyalty on the eve of eternal separation. After a night of debauchery on the 3rd of August 1744, Louis was laid prostrate with a putrid fever. From the 4th to the 12th the King got rapidly worse. Madame de Châteauroux and her confidant Richelieu took possession of the royal chamber, and with the aid of Madame de Laraguais, the *aides-de-camp* and domestics attached to the favourite's interest, closed the door against their enemies. For at not many feet from the bed where the King was lying in a desperate condition, the princes of the blood, the great officers of the Crown, all the dignitaries who yet respected the honour of the Crown and of the Church, Bouillon, La Rochefoucauld, Villeroy, Fitz-james, the Bishop of Soissons, the Jesuit Father Pérusseau the confessor of the King, collected together in the antechamber, scanning eagerly the countenances of the King's attendants as they passed to and fro between the folding-doors of his bedroom. All these felt a pious horror at the bare possibility of a King of France dying without confession and the last consolations of religion. For the inexorable Bishop of Soissons, the chief almoner of the King, and the Father Pérusseau, would listen to no terms of compromise; they demanded the dismissal of the concubine before confession should be accepted and the sacrament administered. Every art was used to dupe the Court and to deceive the King as to the danger of his condition: but all was vain; the terrors of the King were aroused, he fancied in his delirium that he already felt the torments of eternity. On recovering from a fainting state he called aloud for his broth and his confessor; the Châteauroux,

with a hopeless air, gave way to the ecclesiastics; in a few seconds the folding-doors were thrown open, and the bishop cried sternly to the two sisters: '*Le roi vous ordonne, mesdames, de vous retirer de chez lui sur le champ*,' and the pair quitted Metz amid the imprecations of crowds who beheld in them but examples of adultery and incest, and knew not that the short-lived energy he had displayed was due to the mistress—the very object of their execrations.

Very many descriptions have been made of the pathetic frenzy into which the news of the King's illness threw the whole population of Paris. 'Now,' they said, 'now that he 'was about to become a great King, he will be taken from us.' France recalled like a mother her once passionate love and devotion for the bright-faced boy with the golden hair. After they heard that the Queen had left Versailles to go to the bedside of her dying husband, 'For many days,' says Voltaire, 'Paris took no heed of the appointed times for sleep, for waking, 'or for taking food.' The couriers, as they arrived, were beset by crowds eager for intelligence; the churches were besieged day and night by the populace praying for the King's recovery as for the last grace of Heaven. The poor gave to the poor money to make their offerings at the altar, saying, '*Priez 'Dieu pour le roi.*' On the 15th, the King was given over by his doctors, but an empiric stept in, gave him an enormous dose of emetic, and he was saved. The public joy knew no bounds, people embraced in the streets with tears and cries of joy; not a guild of artisans but sang the '*Te Deum;*' and the news spread with electric speed throughout France. The title of *Louis le Bien-aimé* was awarded him by universal acclamation; the gratitude of the people was given him, in fact, not for having done anything, but for not dying; and the King himself, amid the triumphal reception which was prepared for him on his return, exclaimed, 'What have I 'done to be so loved!' But with returning health the passion for Madame de Châteauroux returned also; and one November night he slipt quietly out of the Tuileries and presented himself without warning at the house of his mistress in the Rue du Bac. The favourite was so confounded at this sudden apparition, that at the first interview she made nothing but incoherent speeches; on the next day, however, all her haughtiness returned, and her injured pride made exorbitant demands before she would consent to return to Versailles. Nothing would satisfy her but the disgrace and exile of all who had conspired to drive her away from Metz. The Bishop of Soissons, his confessor, the Dukes de Bouillon and La Roche-

foucauld, all were exiled. Maurepas alone was allowed to remain at the King's earnest prayer, and at the price of the most abject humiliation. The minister was himself to bear to the injured favourite a letter of apology and her own recall. Maurepas, whom the Châteauroux always styled the '*faquinet*,' yielded. He presented himself with his missive in the Rue du Bac, he received no salutation, and when he attempted to kiss the mistress's hand, received but the words, '*Donnez . . . allez-vous en!*' But the indignation and emotions of the last two months, the frenzy of triumph, had fatally agitated the violent nature of the imperious woman, an inflammatory fever raged through her whole system, and after eleven days of transports, convulsions, and delirium; after having been bled eleven times in vain in the feet and the hand, she died on the 1st of December at the age of twenty-seven years in the arms of her sister and discarded rival Madame de Mailly, who forgave everything. Two days afterwards she was buried at Saint Sulpice with a guard under arms to save her body from the insults of the populace.*

The death of Madame de Châteauroux affected the King with less grief than that of Madame de Vintimille; nevertheless he appears to have endeavoured for three or four months to wean himself from all immoral connexions, and to return to the society of the Queen. But Maria Lecszinska, now thirty-five years of age, had quite subsided into a life of monotony and retirement; after tears and some anger at her husband's first infidelities she had made no effort to recover her position. The King had treated her from time to time with marked neglect, even omitting to request her to be seated before the courtiers, and neglecting to provide her with sufficient money for her daily necessities. Hopeless of redress she betook herself to the privacy of her apartments, and confined herself chiefly to the society of the Duke and Duchess de Luynes; she had become prematurely old and sad, incapable of amusing and enjoying amusement. She passed her days in morning prayer, in reading good books, in attending

* Madame de Mailly passed the last years of her life in practices of an exemplary penitence—spending all her time and money on the poor. She visited the prisons and the sick, and publicly washed the feet of the poor; she reserved for herself scarcely enough for her own necessities. She died in 1751, with hair-cloth next her person. On one occasion, as she entered the church of Saint Paul, and some persons gave way to her, a bystander said, '*Voilà bien du train pour une femme perdue!*' She replied, '*Puisque vous la connaissez, priez Dieu pour elle.*'

mass, in the etiquette of the dinner-table, in embroidery and needlework, and in little works of charity which became the serious occupation of her life. She considered herself, in fact, a sort of dowager queen. All the lighter amusements of her youth were abandoned with her guitar and her harpsichord. Regularly after supper she allowed her attendants to betake themselves to the gayer apartments of the château, while she retired to the rooms of the Duchesse de Luynes, where she spent the rest of the evening in a favourite arm-chair by the fireside with the Duchess and three or four elderly friends, among whom were the Cardinal de Luynes and the President Hénault; and night by night the older members would fall asleep to the snoring of an invariable member of this drowsy party—Tintamarre, an old dog of the Duchesse de Luynes.

It was impossible that the King should find relief for his *ennui* and lassitude in such a circle; and ere long he was delivered into the hands of an *intriguante* of the most finished character—one who had been from her cradle reared and educated with the view of becoming a sort of royal Aspasia, and who succeeded in filling for nineteen years the anomalous position of queen-mistress of France.

In the financial world of Paris, headed by the twelve *intendants* of the provinces, who were, Law said, the true governors of France—in the *salons* of the *fermiers généraux*, adorned with all the luxury and display which their immense wealth enabled them to supply, moved at that time a young beauty of twenty-three years of age, who had from her childhood been styled by her mother *un vrai morceau de roi*, and educated in all the arts of a Greek courtesan of the time of Pericles; she could act, she could sing, she could dance, and exercise all the arts and witchery of a syren to perfection. She was the nominal daughter of a M. Poisson, a fraudulent and bankrupt subordinate of Pâris Duvernai, who had been hung in effigy, but her real father was supposed to be a *fermier général*, who had adopted her and married her to his nephew Lenormant d'Étioles. In the immoral atmosphere of her early home her brilliant qualities had received the precise training which befitted a royal courtesan, and by the introduction of her adoptive father she had gathered round her the most noted of the men of letters of the day, and lived in familiar intercourse with Fontenelle, the Abbé de Bernis, Maupertuis, and Voltaire.

To become the mistress of the King had been the earliest dream of Mademoiselle Poisson, of which a curious proof is afforded

by the list of pensions granted by her after her elevation; among them was one to a certain Madame Lebon, thus inscribed —'600 *livres à Madame Lebon pour lui avoir prédit à l'âge de neuf ans qu'elle serait un jour la maîtresse de Louis XV.*' Having become Madame d'Étioles, she lost no opportunity of endeavouring to attract the King's notice. After many manœuvres, after fluttering before his eyes in a blue dress and in a pony phaeton at various hunting parties, she contrived to gain the marked attention of the monarch at a masqued ball at the Hôtel de Ville, at Paris, and by the mediation of Binet, one of the King's valets, the first interview took place. On the occasion of the second the lady, who was a consummate actress, simulated such fear of her husband in case of a return home, that the King kept her concealed for some days in apartments above his own, and a little later gave her the assurance that she should be publicly installed as his mistress at Versailles. Her presentation at Court was delayed by the absence of the King, who went to be present with the army, and to be a spectator of the victory of Fontenoy; but even in the hurry of battle and the flush of victory, the amorous monarch found opportunity to write her daily letters. Madame d'Étioles took advantage of the delay to ingratiate herself with the Queen, who, convinced of the futility of endeavouring to regain the king's affection, concluded from the demeanour of the adventuress that she would be perhaps as humble a mistress as any other, and on the King's return from the campaign the new favourite was publicly presented to both King and Queer, with expressions of favour from the latter which excited the astonishment of the courtiers; and in a few days her humble extraction was concealed by the title of the Marquise de Pompadour, taken from an extinct family.*

The history of Madame de Pompadour for the next twenty years is the history of France. The new mistress was more than a female Prime Minister—she was, in fact, the concubine-Queen of the country; and, in the name of an apathetic monarch, incapable of any initiative, she exercised an ineffaceable influence on the destinies of France and of Europe. It was not at once, however, that she reached such a height of ascendancy in the King's councils; she had to win her position

* At a dinner-party in the provinces at which Monsieur d'Étioles was present, a *gentilhomme campagnard* was informed in a whisper that he was the husband of Madame de Pompadour. The *gentilhomme campagnard* shortly afterwards, innocently and to the amusement of the company, addressed M. d'Étioles as 'Monsieur de Pompadour.'

step by step with all the arts natural to an *intriguante* of her condition, and to assert her position day by day against the torrent of scandal, lampoons, called *Poissonades*, and *bons mots* about herself, her manners, her name, and her family, which daily flooded the palace.

When Madame de Mailly became the King's mistress the journalist Barbier declared there was nothing to be said against it, as the Nesles were one of the first names of the monarchy, but the smallest *bourgeois* in Paris felt it a national dishonour to have a Mademoiselle Poisson raised to such a notoriously bad eminence. But no woman other than one of the new mistress's birth and education could have filled the place she did for twenty years. Louis XV. was the most complete representative of the time in all its weaknesses; neither as man nor as king had he any notion of duty. The Abbé Galiani said of him '*qu'il faisait le plus vilain métier, le 'métier du roi le plus à contre cœur possible.*' The duties of a king were to him something incomprehensible and insupportable, and the common duties of man still more so. He was afflicted with the great malady of the age, *ennui*, to an incalculable degree; his heart and soul were eaten up and devoured by it, and the history of his amours is in fact the history of his *ennui*. The talent of Madame de Pompadour consisted in observing this, and to the unwearied skill which she displayed in alleviating the moral malady which devoured all the energies of the royal egotist was due the secure dominion which she exercised for so many years over the King's mind. Every device the wit of a scheming woman could invent was employed by turns to lessen the weight of apathy and gloom which lay heavy on the monarch's mind. She sang, she played the harpsichord, and like a new Scheherazade she invented or discovered a thousand and one stories to dissipate the royal listlessness. Every amusement public and private, which she could imagine, followed one after the other in brilliant succession; and she kept him in constant movement from *fêtes* at Paris to *fêtes* at Fontainebleau, from *fêtes* at Belle Vue to *fêtes* at La Celle, and from *fêtes* at La Celle to *fêtes* at Compiègne. The skill for which she had been celebrated in private theatricals here stood her in good stead. She began by turning the holy week into a series of operatic performances, in which she took a leading part. Then the Duc de Richelieu, who had seen her act before her appearance at Versailles, whispered to the King what a fund of amusement lay buried in the talents of his mistress. A royal theatre was organised; she assumed the principal part in a hundred different plays, supported by

court *seigneurs* and their ladies in subordinate characters; she appeared by turns as Venus, as Hero; as the Herminia of Tasso; as the shepherdess Églé, or Galathea, or as Urania in a dress spangled with stars. Her fine voice, her grace and affected simplicity, and the brilliant series of costumes in which she appeared night after night, renewed continually the charms of her first impression in the royal eyes. The ballets were especially magnificent, and the costumes were of the richest and most fairylike character.* To obtain an entrance into the royal theatre was one of the supreme ends of ambition of the courtiers, and the favourite at times gave herself the pleasure of refusing her door to a Maréchal de Noailles or a Prince de Conti. But in spite of every effort the royal *ennui* was sometimes incurable—as once at La Celle, when the *marquise*, after having surprised the King with a splendid ballet festival which filled the whole park of her *château*, came up to the monarch for a few words of compliment, but received for all thanks a yawn and the reply '*j'aurais mieux aimé une comédie!*'

But beneath the brilliant exterior which the life of the reigning favourite offered to the world there were daily inward agonies of heart and mind which would have moved to something like pity her bitterest enemies, had they been aware of them. Of feeble health—her visage was pale and thin, and she had expectoration of blood in her youth—the charms of person which had first enslaved the King vanished in the course of three or four years, and she speedily became a mistress of mere form and ceremony. A succession of younger beauties gratified the passions of the monarch, while Madame de Pompadour had to rely for the maintenance of her ascendancy on the power of habit, which was all-engrossing over so feeble a nature, and to the inexhaustible devices which intrigue and her accomplishments in the arts of pleasure and amusement afforded her. To sustain herself on that slippery summit she had need of daily and hourly anxiety and care. The secret pangs and fears of such a life were incalculable. She was obliged to be on the watch for every change of the King's humour, to keep constant watch on all his actions, to divine all his thoughts and wishes, and to be ever on her guard against both male and female conspirators and their jealous contrivances. En-

* In a manuscript preserved at the Library of the Arsenal, all the theatrical costumes of Madame de Pompadour can be studied. Among them we may note that of Herminia, a *dolimant* of cherry-coloured satin trimmed with ermine, a petticoat of blue satin embroidered with gold and starred with gold.

vied by all the light women of the Court, despised and set at nought by the ministers in the early part of her reign, hated by the whole nation, and vilified day by day in countless lampoons and pasquinades, which passed from mouth to mouth, her life was exhausted in a continual struggle to maintain her position. And the smiling sultana, the mistress of a dozen *châteaux*, the insatiable channel of the King's prodigality, would retire from public view exhausted with the efforts which her histrionic position required, to the privacy of her apartment, throw herself down on her seat before her waiting maid, and let loose a torrent of complaints on the bitterness of her destiny. Her strength failed her under the severity of the daily ordeal which was the necessity of her position; and when her life had thus been expended as a slave of royal caprice, she was, as D'Argenson says, as much forgotten by the King and all Versailles a few days after her death as though she had never existed.*

As long as she lived, however, she held supreme control over home and foreign politics. Shameful as is the history of the ascendancy of Madame de Pompadour, her influence was great in controlling the bigot party at Court, at the head of which were the Dauphin and the King's daughters. The memoirs of the Duc de Luynes reveal the immense part which the latter played in the life of the King; their intolerance and that of their adherents, and the direction which they attempted to assume in Church matters, might have made the history of France still more gloomy at this period, had the party which attached itself at the commencement of her career to Madame de Pompadour, which consisted indeed of most of the men of merit in France, such as D'Argenson, Machault, Duvernai, Quesnay, and the Encyclopedists, not had the advantage of her domination over the character of Louis. She made and unmade ministers, was all-powerful in internal affairs, held a balance between the clergy and the Parliament, directed the foreign policy of the country, and decided on war or peace. In addressing ministers and ambassadors, she spoke for herself and the King, as '*nous*.' She renewed the traditions of the etiquette of the court of Louis XIV. When she received, a single chair gave notice to all to stand in her presence. Her carriage had such armorial bearings and

* The remark which Louis made on the day of the funeral of Madame de Pompadour is well known :—'*La Marquise a bien mau-vais temps pour son voyage.*' This was all the regret he was heard to express for the mistress with whom he had lived twenty years.

hammercloth as dukes only were allowed to use, and a gentleman of one of the oldest families of Guienne carried her mantle on his arm, walked by the side of her sedan-chair, or waited for her in the antechamber when she took an airing. Her *maître d'hotel*, Collin, presented the mistress her napkin with a Cross of Saint Louis on his breast. In the midst of this life of splendour she endeavoured to raise her family in some degree to the level of her own fortune. Her mother was dead, but she purchased the family vault of the *Créquis*, and placed her body in a princely mausoleum. Her daughter died prematurely, but she had previously, though in vain, twice endeavoured to make a splendid marriage for her; once with the Comte du Luc, the son of Louis XV. and Madame de Vintimille; and afterwards with the Duc de Fronsac, the son of Richelieu. Richelieu, courtier as he was, declined the proffered alliance, saying that he had the honour of belonging to the princes of the House of Lorraine by his mother, and that he was obliged to ask their consent. After the death of her daughter, her father, a shameless cynical buffoon, and her brother, a person of some modesty and merit, alone remained to her, and on them she lavishly bestowed such gifts as fortune had allotted to her. While thus taking care of her family, she neglected not to draw upon the public finances to supply her own prodigalities, and the private expenses of the mistress for the nineteen years of her reign have been said to amount to thirty-six millions. The sale of her effects after her death lasted for more than a year.

But it was not the prodigality of Madame de Pompadour which was her most pernicious quality; year by year under her influence the spirit, morals, and resources of the country grew more and more degraded. No minister could keep his place who was not entirely her creature. Maurepas, relying on the favour of the Queen and the princesses, found liberal employment for his caustic spirit in composing lampoons and satirical verses of which she was the subject. His repartees when they met were of the most cutting character; and on one occasion when she reproached him with not paying proper respect to the King's mistresses, he replied, '*Je les ai toujours* '*respectées de quelque espèce qu'elles fussent.*' One intolerable lampoon, the work of the minister, at last reached her; she could endure him no longer, and on pretence of fear of poison, affecting to believe he had been fatal to Madame de Châteauroux, she obtained his dismissal from the King. Two ministers of merit, Machault and the younger D'Argenson, still remained in the Ministry. Machault was her own *protégé*,

and she continued to make use of him until the attempt of Damiens, when his more than suspicious conduct towards herself afforded her an opportunity of gaining his dismissal. She got rid of the Comte d'Argenson on account of his antipathy to the Austrian alliance at the beginning of the Seven Years' War; and she continued henceforward to fill the Ministry with her own creatures.

The enemies of Madame de Pompadour had hoped that with her failing health would also decline her influence over the King; but the result was the contrary. The favourite intrigued so as to become from the mistress the indispensable female friend of Louis. Continually on the watch to prevent him from being ensnared into a permanent attachment to some great lady of the Court, she became the procuress and the confidante of all kinds of base amours without a trace of sentiment and without a hope of a morrow. After harbouring some of these poor creatures in her own hotel close to the Palace, the too celebrated house in the Rue St. Médéric, situate in an obscure quarter in Versailles, called the *Parc aux Cerfs*, was taken as an asylum for these obscure passions of the King, who was received there simply as a *seigneur* of the Court,* while all children as soon as born were taken away from the establishment. The infamous notoriety of this abode was increased by fabulous rumours, and in the increasing destitution of the country, mothers trembled for their children at the bare mention of the King's name; and in time Louis the *bien-aimé* became the *tyran*, the *monstre*, in the mouths of the people. He was even named Herod, and was believed, like the terrible *seigneur* of the middle ages, the prototype of Blue Beard, to endeavour to reinvigorate his decrepid powers by bathing in the blood of murdered infants. Owing to this belief, on the occasion of some severely cruel measures taken by the police, a dangerous revolt broke out in Paris, and the King from henceforth never ventured to exhibit himself in his capital, but had roads made, by which he might pass from one *château* to another without passing through Paris or indeed any of the neighbouring towns. One of these, that from the Porte Maillot to St. Denis, is still called the *Chemin de la Revolte*. The King became, as Chesterfield remarked, both despised and hated at the same time; and the reigning mistress was regarded with unmitigated detestation as the unhallowed and shameless partner and abettor

* One of the denizens of the *Parc aux Cerfs* having made the discovery that her visitor was the King, was shut up in a madhouse.

in his scandalous vices and heartless misgovernment. Although the Clergy and the Parliament nourished against each other inflexible rancour and hostility, and carried on a factious and interminable warfare about the Bull Unigenitus, which exasperated the patience of the King, she contrived to incur the enmity of both these bodies. Of the first by her countenance of the scheme of Machault for the taxation of the property of the Church, and of the second by encouraging the King in his opposition to the right of remonstrance. It was indeed astonishing that the artful woman succeeded, in spite of the hostility of every party but that of the philosophers, in maintaining her authority. At times it seemed that the influence of the King's daughters, who bravely took their places at the royal supper-parties, would succeed in procuring her dismissal; but she contrived to make her position in the Court more secure by professions of repentance and by proclamation of her present innocent relations. There was nothing she desired so much, she gave out, as to make atonement for the past. To give support to her new character she offered to return to the house of her own husband if he would receive her back, and wrote to him to that effect, while by a private message delivered by the Prince de Conti she warned him to be on his guard against taking her at her word. By this artifice she outwitted the Queen and her confessor, and the unhappy Maria Lecszinska was obliged to withdraw the opposition she had made to receiving Madame de Pompadour as one of her ladies in waiting, was forced to allow her to have a place in her own carriage, to dine at her table. The Queen at last consented to dine with the King and his mistress at Choisy, was treated with all the honours due to a Queen-Mother, and affected to be enchanted; while the mistress was finally permitted to have her own *tribune* in the royal chapel at Versailles and to make the *quête* among the congregation at Easter. Her ascendancy reached its culminating period at the commencement of the Seven Years' War, a war by which the best interests of France were brought to utter ruin, by which, throughout Europe, whole kingdoms and provinces were plunged in bloodshed and desolation and a million of lives were uselessly and shamefully sacrificed.

The primary cause of that deplorable page in European history was undoubtedly the satirical tongue of King Frederic and his caustic sayings about the petticoat government of Louis XV. It must, however, be added that the King himself willingly lent himself to the new line of policy; his besotted bigotry increased as he grew older and grosser in his vices; he had become ashamed of the alliance of a Catholic king with the

chief of the heretics on the Continent, and in the midst of the debauchery of the Parc aux Cerfs he dreamed of becoming the champion of the faith, and of expiating the foulness of his daily life by war and persecution. But nevertheless neither King nor mistress would have decided on taking the fatal step which was a reversal of the whole of the past policy of France and led to so terrible a punishment for the first violation of faith in 1740, had it not been for the fatal epistle of Maria Theresa, in which the daughter of the Hapsburgs wrote with her own hand to a royal mistress, styling her 'friend and cousin,' and couched in terms of shameful flattery. So unlooked-for an exaltation from such a quarter turned Madame de Pompadour's head; she felt endowed with strength sufficient to bear down all opposition, and devoted her whole influence and energies to the cause of her imperial friend, while she dreamed of captured cities, great victories, a new order of policy, and a glorious place in the annals of her country. It was impossible to hope to get any of the older and more experienced statesmen of France to carry out her plans, and she therefore relied entirely on a creature of her own, known in history as the Cardinal de Bernis, whom she had recently introduced into the Government.

The Cardinal de Bernis was originally a round-cheeked fresh-coloured little abbé, great in madrigals and ladies' poetry, called by Voltaire '*le bouquetier du Mont Parnasse*,' who had been long waiting about the Court for advancement. He began by making suit to Fleury, and when warned by the Cardinal not to expect office in his lifetime, replied, '*Monseigneur*, '*j'attendrai.*' Bernis' opportunity was now arrived under the Pompadour, and at a little pavilion not inaptly named the *Babiole*, on a hill above the château of the mistress at Bellevue, on the 22nd of September 1755, the famous interview took place between Bernis, the Comte de Staremberg, and Madame de Pompadour, in which the preliminaries of the calamitous Treaty of Versailles took place, and the monarchy of France was signed away by an unprincipled priest and a shameless woman.

Having secured the Treaty of Versailles, the emissaries of Maria Theresa proceeded to buy over the ministers of Catherine of Russia, who was as ready as the Pompadour to seize the first opportunity of taking revenge on Frederic for the bitter gibes he had passed on herself, and a scheme for the partition of Prussia was speedily decided upon, into which Saxony was also induced to enter. But at the very outset of the war, an event occurred which cast Madame de Pompadour into the extremity of despair. The endless squabbles of the clergy

and the Parliament still continued, complicated with the opposition which the latter maintained to the financial decrees of the King, and the tenacity with which they asserted their right of remonstrance. The King, in a fit of exasperation, applied such severe measures to the Parliament, that nearly two hundred magistrates renounced office. The people, whose misery was daily increasing, and to whom the Government became daily more odious, took part warmly with the Parliament, and curses loud and deep were heard in the streets directed against the Pompadour and the *tyran des Français.* Seditious cries were raised, the King's death was openly wished for, and it was publicly said that the best thing that could happen for France would be *toucher le Roi, avertir le Roi.* A weak-minded man, who had lived as servant in Parliamentary families, determined to be the instrument, not for killing, but for warning the King; he went to Versailles, waited for him in the *Cour de Marbre,* and stabbed him in the back with a penknife. The King, though the wound was barely an inch deep, took to his bed in a dreadful state of fright; his confessor attended him day and night, and the Pompadour had commands to leave. She persisted, however, in remaining, following the advice of the crafty old Maréchale de Mirepoix, who said, '*qui quitte la partie la perd.*' On the King's getting up from his bed her influence grew stronger than ever, while she revenged herself on the King's ministers, Machault and the younger D'Argenson, who had countenanced her dismissal, by getting them superseded. The unhappy man Damiens was executed on the Place de la Grêve, with a refinement of torture which became proverbial, while the great ladies of the Court sat at the windows, looking complacently on as the poor wretch was being tortured with an atrocity too horrible now to dwell upon even in recital.

After this event the domination of Madame de Pompadour was more assured than ever, and she threw all her energies into the terrible contest with redoubled assurance, flushed with the unexpected success of the conquest of Minorca, in spite of the opposition of the unfortunate Byng, and still more elated with the victory of Hastenbeck, gained by the Maréchal d'Estrées over the Duke of Cumberland. But after this deceptive appearance of good fortune, victory abandoned the arms of France; henceforward Madame de Pompadour knew nothing but disaster.

England, after carrying on a desultory warfare against France for two years, awoke in all her might at the sound of the majestic voice of Pitt. The two greatest men of the age, who would have been great men in any age—Pitt and Frederic

—entered into close alliance, and while the former year by year swept the ocean with English ships, ruined the commerce of France, and stripped her of all her colonial possessions, the other stood like a noble animal at bay dashing hither and thither, amid the multitude of pursuers who attempted to hem him in, appearing never so great or so unconquerable as on the morrow of temporary reverses, dividing his enemies with every device of war and politics, and annihilating one after the other the formidable masses which opposed him.

The escape of the Prussian king from the toils which were set for him was indeed marvellous; but he owed his preservation alone to the weakness of resolve of his enemies, to their divided counsels, and to the reckless spirit of court intrigue which rendered futile all the power arrayed against him. Both the French and Russian generals contrived always to leave him some means of escape from ruin through fear of a change of policy in their respective Courts. Even Choiseul wrote to the ambassador of Vienna that it was not for their interest that Frederic should be utterly ruined. The fall of the Pompadour at any moment might, Richelieu well knew, bring about a total change in the policy of France, and for this reason he kept away from the favourite's general Soubise at the shameful disaster at Rosbach, where Frederic's stern veterans of the north scattered in wild confusion the disorganised legions of France, officered by the gay and frivolous *noblesse*, who carried with them to the field a second army of hair-dressers, cooks, courtesans, and *valetaille* of all descriptions, and spent hours in the morning, in front of their tents at their *toilette*, under the hands of their *valets* and barbers.

Madame de Pompadour had neither capacity nor judgment sufficient to enable her to struggle against the tide of misfortune. Nevertheless, in spite of disasters and defeats, she clung to the Austrian alliance with almost Roman tenacity. When her creature the Cardinal de Bernis hesitated to carry on her reckless policy, she had him dismissed and exiled from Court, and brought the Duc de Choiseul into the Ministry. It is sufficiently characteristic of the period, and of the increasing degradation of the Government, that Choiseul, who began office as the creature of Madame de Pompadour, came in time to be regarded as a patriot and the best hope of his country. Although of undoubtedly superior capacity to Bernis, he did little to restore the fallen fortunes of France. India and Canada became irretrievably lost, and the best portion of the French colonies in the West Indies. The English even, for the first time since the middle ages, effected a lodgement on

the French soil, and took possession of Belle Isle on the coast of Brittany. The new minister in vain endeavoured to oppose the famous Family Compact to the ascendancy of England. He too was, after fruitless efforts and blood and treasure spent without limit and without profit, obliged, by the increasing exhaustion of the country, to do that for which Bernis was dismissed—counsel submission; and the Peace of Paris was concluded; a peace of ignominy for France, since she abandoned every object for which she had gone to war, resigned an immense colonial empire to her ancient rival, and undertook to destroy the fortifications of Dunkirk. The two German Powers remained precisely as they were, after having subjected all Germany to devastations equal to those of the Thirty Years' War. The only Power who was a gainer in this fearful contest was England, who, invigorated by liberty and inspired by the heroic impulse of Chatham, became the undisputed arbitress of the ocean, the unrivalled mistress of India and America, and established an unchallenged supremacy in every quarter of the world.

One great event only after the Seven Years' War occurred during the reign of the Pompadour—the destruction of the order of the Jesuits. During her last years the opposition of the Parliaments, both of Paris and the provinces, against the arbitrary and faithless measures taken by the Court to supply the wants of a ruined treasury acquired unprecedented boldness and persistency; but she died before matters came to a climax by their dissolution and the institution of the Parliament Maupéou, against which Beaumarchais directed the sharpest shafts of his wit and irony. The increasing anxieties with which she had had to contend ever since the opening of the Seven Years' War accelerated the progress of the fever which devoured her feeble and attenuated frame, and hurried her to a premature grave. In vain did she as her charms departed plaster her faded leaden cheeks with white and red, and use every art to conceal her emaciation and her lassitude from the world; all saw in her a sick, dying, disappointed woman. Nothing remained in her latter days of her former attractions but the brilliancy of her eyes, which the glow of fever and the spareness of her features rendered still more lustrous and large. Up to the last hour, however, Madame de Pompadour remained the favourite and the mistress; she gave audiences as long as she drew breath, and her last words as her confessor left her are redolent of the grace with which she maintained her authority through life. '*Un moment, Monsieur le curé, nous nous en irons ensemble.*'

If we turn from the political to the artistic and literary influence of Madame de Pompadour, history will take a more favourable aspect of her character. It is true the best painters she patronised—Boucher and Vanloo—may be styled the mere Raphael and Rubens of the Parc aux Cerfs, but she possessed in an eminent degree the taste of the age. She founded the porcelain manufactory of Sèvres, and there is hardly an article of furniture from the carriage, the sedan-chair, the fireplace, down to the fan and toothpick, on which she did not place her stamp: she was the true Muse and nursing-mother of the florid style of ornament which still bears her name.

For nearly five years the King remained without a mistress. Events occurred in his family which made even *him* live decently for a time. The Dauphin, the father of Louis XVI., died at the end of 1765, and the Queen in 1768.* Choiseul as chief minister was all powerful. His facility of getting through business, his knowledge of affairs, the services he had rendered, the charm of his manners, all combined to make him indispensable; and the friends of the minister fondly hoped that since the monarch had reached the age of sixty, he was in some measure beyond the reach of female seduction, and the reign of Choiseul would thenceforth be permanent and absolute. One attempt was made to introduce a Madame d'Esparbes to the King, but M. de Choiseul destroyed her hopes by taking the lady by the chin as he met her on the grand staircase at Versailles, in the presence of all the courtiers, and asking her '*Petite, comment vont vos affaires?*' M. de Choiseul, however, was detested by an active party of the court and the nation; all the bigots, all the partisans of the Jesuits, all the adversaries of the Parliament and the Jansenists, were eager to have recourse to any influence in order to eject him from power, and the character of the times is well illustrated by an anecdote connected with the advent of Madame du Barry. On the day of her first presentation at court, previously to her being publicly declared the King's mistress, two ecclesiastics met at a dinner-table, and the one invited the other to toast the presentation of the new Esther, who was to deliver the Jewish people from the oppression of

---

* The King on the death of the Dauphin showed more care for the future of his country than on any other occasion. '*Pauvre France*,' he said; '*un roi de cinquante-cinq ans et un dauphin de onze.*' The Dauphin died at Fontainebleau; from his death-bed he saw the Court carriages getting ready to leave, the Court were only waiting for his decease. '*Allons*,' he said, '*il faut en finir, nous impatientons trop de monde.*'

Haman. Haman was the Duc de Choiseul. The new Esther was Madame du Barry.

By the elevation of Madame du Barry the King exhibited to his subjects every form of scandalous life. After living openly with four sisters of noble blood, he lived in double adultery with one of the *bourgeoisie*, and now he descended to a daughter of the people, of unknown father, whose original name was Jeanne Bécu, and who at one time had gained her living by hawking wares in the street, and was at the time of her elevation the mistress of a gamester the Chevalier du Barry, who made use of her surpassing and sensual beauty of person to attract victims to his card-table. The King, through the officiousness of his valet Lebel, had enjoyed the opportunity of seeing her through a window in a wall at a private supper-party in the palace. The voluptuous charms of the courtesan inspired the sexagenarian King with a new passion, and he resolved never to part from her. She was established at Versailles; she was married to an elder brother of her former lover; she was presented at Court, where the brilliancy of her beauty disarmed for an instant the disgust of the spectators. Yet at first even in that depraved circle the new mistress was quite alone; speedily, however, a little party from the adversaries of Choiseul gathered around her, of which Richelieu, Maupéou, and D'Aiguillon were the chiefs.

Soon, moreover, Choiseul himself began to bend to the mistress, and then the King had the satisfaction of seeing the last creature of his choice surrounded by a *cortège* of the noblest ladies of France; the Duchesse de Mirepoix, the Duchesse de Montmorenci, the Duchesse de Valentinois, and the Comtesse de l'Hôpital. The hospitality of Chantilly was offered to her by the Prince de Condé; at the camp of Compiègne she was received with royal honours by M. de la Tour du Pin; and at one of her *levers* the *grand aumônier* of the King and the Papal Nuncio were seen in attendance, and to hand her her *mules* as she descended from bed. The mutual mistrust, however, of Choiseul and the Du Barry was too deeply-seated not to reappear, and too necessary to the schemes of D'Aiguillon and Maupéou to be allowed to die. Prompted by her *coterie*, the favourite invented daily some malicious device suggesting to the King the dismissal of the minister. Now she tossed an orange up in the air crying, '*Saute, Choiseul;*' now on the dismissal of her *chef de cuisine* she cried to the King, '*J'ai renvoyé mon Choiseul;*' until at last the weak-minded monarch submitted to the intrigue, and exiled the minister to his estate

at Chanteloup, with a letter couched in terms of the most ungracious and imperious brevity.

The dismissal of Choiseul was the only instance of the political action of Madame du Barry; she was after all, as her subsequent life, up to the time of her tragic end in the days of Terror, proved, a *bonne fille*, and bore no malice against any one. She did what she could to alleviate the disgrace of Choiseul; but the necessities of her infamous position entailed upon her the practice of all the arts calculated to gratify and enslave a worn-out debauchee. The vices of the King had long thrown off the mask of refinement. He delighted in coarse language and vulgar familiarity. The number of the victims of his profligate indulgences continually increased; and at length it was from one of these wretched beings that he caught the small-pox which carried him off.

Just a year before his death the Abbé de Beauvais had the courage, in preaching before him on the Thursday in Holy Week, to throw out the following daring allusion to the last shameful *liaison* of the King:—'*Salomon, rassasié des voluptés, las d'avoir épuisé, pour réveiller ses sens flétris, tous les genres de plaisir qui entourent le trône, finit par en chercher une espèce nouvelle dans les vils restes de la corruption publique.*'* After his death another ecclesiastic, the Abbé of Sainte Geneviève, on being bantered about the inefficacy of his addresses to his saint during the illness of the King, replied, '*De quoi vous plaignez-vous? Est-ce qu'il n'est pas mort?*'

The King's death-bed was one of the most revolting scenes in all history. The Du Barry and her associates up to the last moment succeeded in keeping away the King's confessor. The Archbishop of Paris, warned by Richelieu that the dismissal of the Du Barry would be the signal for the return of Choiseul, temporised with the King's conscience as long as any hope remained of his recovery. The subject of hot dispute between the Choiseul and d'Aiguillon factions was whether the King should have the sacraments administered to him or no; and the *salons* of the Du Barry were crowded or empty just as the news of the King's improvement or the contrary swayed to and fro the tide of the depraved courtiers. At last, in the midst of a repulsive scene between the dying sexagenarian and his mistress, the Archbishop,

* It is but just to Louis XV. to say that the Abbé de Beauvais, who, in spite of his aristocratic name, was of very humble origin, was not sent to the Bastille for his boldness, but rewarded with a bishopric.

with a sudden impulse of indignation, interfered, insisted on her retirement, and the reign of the Du Barry was at an end.

The last words on record of the King were, '*Quoiqu'il ne dût* '*compte de sa conduite qu'à Dieu seul, il se repentait d'avoir* '*causé du scandale à ses sujets.*' Thus, in even his very meagre expression of contrition evincing all the pride of absolutism with his dying breath.

The character of Louis XV. is one on which all the arts of indignant rhetoric are thrown away. The story of his life cannot be made more shameful than truth itself displays it. One trait, however, is wanting to complete the delineation of his worthless nature—his mania for speculating in corn. He became the chief partner of a company which forestalled corn, and was in fact a monopoly. From the exceptional advantages they enjoyed, they created periods of local and artificial famine in the different provinces for purposes of private gain. The King thus traded on the hunger of his people. The most abject courtier of Versailles could not avoid feeling a twinge of shame when he noted on his bureau day by day the lists of the prices of grain in the different provinces as a guide for speculation. From such shameful dealings arose the legend of the *Pacte de famine* which lingered in the memories of the people, and the spectre of which arose in terrible form during the most horrible scenes of the Revolution. The populace, it must be remembered, went to Versailles to seek the *boulanger*. It was at this period of the reign that the following lines were affixed to the pedestal of his statue recently put up in the Place Louis XV. now the Place de la Concorde:—

'Il est ici comme à Versailles—
Sans cœur et sans entrailles.'

The Family Compact left behind it likewise a fatal remembrance, and the blood of the slain so uselessly and shamefully squandered in the Seven Years' War haunted the memory of the people, made hateful all thought of the Austrian alliance, and gave a deadlier intensity to the vengeance which sought for the life of the *Autrichienne*.

One very peculiar characteristic of the government of Louis XV. which we have not hitherto touched upon, was the system of secret diplomacy he carried on unknown to his ministers. It may be said that he was doubly to blame for the evil which he brought upon France, as he had twofold means of knowing the real state of affairs. This underhand correspondence was maintained by the King at very great cost; the Prince de

Conti directed it under the King's orders. That mysterious character, the Chevalier d'Eon, so well known in London, was one of his clandestine agents. The expense of these emissaries was defrayed out of the King's profits in his corn speculations. By means of these occult practices the King was frequently better informed than his own ministers; and it was one of the pleasures of his strange nature to revel with an inexpressive face in the inward enjoyment of his superior knowledge, and not to show a trace of it to his official advisers. None of his mistresses were able to discover the source of this private intelligence, although the King suspected Madame de Pompadour of having once obtained access to the cabinet in which the papers were kept by means of a golden key taken from his person in a moment of convivial excess.

Modern history can certainly find no parallel to so long and so shameful a reign as that of Louis XV., and to the legacy of ignominy and disorder entailed upon the nation cursed with such a sovereign. He succeeded in utterly annihilating the magnificent *prestige* with which the virtues of Saint Louis, the wisdom and valour of Henri IV., and the great ambition of Louis XIV. had surrounded the monarchy.

The consideration that the monarch knew and felt to what an abyss the nation was descending rendered still more criminal the apathy and vice of his remorseless reign. '*Tout cela durera* '*autant que moi. Après nous le déluge*,' was the selfish consolation in which he shrouded himself, and he died as he lived, without a tinge of anything like contrition.* Yet he was not without qualities which might have been turned to some good had he ever been subjected to any kind of moral discipline, and had

---

* The King's character by continual demoralisation acquired an incredible degree of cynicism. He was present on one occasion when courtiers were speaking of an officer who was coarse, brutal, and ill-mannerly, though a good soldier. '*Enfin*,' the King said, '*c'est* '*un brave homme, c'est tout dire!*' Thus attempting to bring contempt on the last remaining virtue of the *noblesse*—courage. The Cross of St. Louis was brought into disrepute by being given for the worst services. The Duc de la Vrillière, at the instance of a courtesan, spat upon it.

Like Henry III. Louis XV. endeavoured to associate profligacy with devotional practices; he would read sermons to his mistresses and go down on his knees and pray with his victims in the *Parc aux Cerfs*. He was fond of talking about maladies, death-bed scenes, and graves, and worms, and epitaphs; he professed to have the gift of reading death in a courtier's face, and terrified several of them with a notice of this kind.

there not been a fatal lack of will and decision of purpose which left him, as an observer said, with less power in the middle of his Court than an *avocat* of the Châtelet.

Though there was a lamentable absence of the ideal in his character,—an utter incapacity for enjoying any of the pleasures of the imagination; though he had none of the literary or artistic tastes of Louis XIV., yet his letters to the Maréchal de Noailles prove that he was not wanting in political capacity. He was very good-humoured; indulgent to those about him and harsh to his subjects; he submitted to any neglect on the part of his attendants with the utmost patience; he was not unnecessarily cruel, and, provided he could have a life of undisturbed enjoyment, he wanted no change, and was willing that everybody else should be at peace too, and would have had, as d'Argenson says, no objection even to add the satisfaction of a little glory to the rest of his pleasures if it had not cost too much trouble. But between the promptings of his own judgment, the advice of ministers, the counter-schemes of their rivals, and the intrigues of his mistresses, he could rarely decide upon any line of action, and if he did, after a short effort he resigned himself to his former apathy.

But without attempting to absolve the King from the immense weight of ignominy which will for ever remain attached to his memory, it must be allowed that he was essentially the product of his age and of his time. Eleven years before the death of Louis XIV., in the year 1709, Leibnitz, with most prophetic foresight, signalised the increase of the spirit of disbelief in Providence and in a future state of retribution, together with the total absence of all generous feeling and patriotic spirit, and of care for true fame or for posterity, and declared that a vast revolution must certainly arrive to chastise the infidelity of the age. Later in the century d'Argenson, in many remarkable passages, testifies to the progress of evil which had continued to degrade the minds of men. The outer show of society was never more brilliant or captivating. The charm of manner, the refinement of taste, the polish of the language of intercourse, had never attained greater perfection; all was glitter on the surface, but all was rottenness below. Frivolity, selfishness, contempt for all that was elevated and noble, no genuine devotion, an entire absence of all ideal aspiration and of all the sterling affections of the heart, were united with courtly servility and a mere mechanical uniformity in religious observances. One of the passages of D'Argenson is extremely striking:—

'Le cœur est une faculté dont nous nous privons chaque jour faute

d'exercice, au lieu que l'esprit s'anime chaque jour. C'est l'esprit joint au cœur qui forme l'héroïsme, le courage, le sublime, et d'où résulte le génie. Faute d'affection et de la faculté cordiale, ce royaume-ci périra, je le prédis.

'On ne voit que des gens aujourd'hui,' he says elsewhere, 'dont le cœur est bête comme un cochon ; car ce siècle est tourné à cette paralysie de cœur.'

It is impossible to imagine to what lower depths yet such a society might have descended had human intelligence not possessed energy sufficient to throw out some counter-irritants to rouse into activity and revolt the dormant energies of both heart and soul. Given the preceding history of France, all religious sincerity and real earnestness banished from the Court and country by the persecution of the Protestants and Jansenists, and the genius and popularity of such teachers as Voltaire and Rousseau become at once intelligible. Yet amid the errors and impurities of their lives and doctrines, each preached a truth of which so corrupt and sceptic a generation had especial need; the one that action should be a chief end of existence; the other, that in the absence of religion the best aids to a moral life are nature and simplicity. The irreligious character of the revolution which these and their fellow-workmen and the Encyclopedists brought about followed logically enough from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and a century and a half of Satanic persecution directed against the Huguenots—persecutions in the time of Louis XV., not the work of fanatics, but proceeding from a vicious King and a sceptical Court. The injury permanently done to the nation by such insensate intolerance is incalculable. The most earnest and devotedly religious spirits of France were either driven into exile or extinguished. When the earnest spirit of Protestantism was driven out, the earnest spirit of Catholicism decayed likewise; a mocking hypocritical uniformity took its place; license and corruption flourished unreproved; and when Deism and Atheism arose, they found no antagonists worthy of respect. It were a melancholy thing to resign ourselves to the conclusion that so shameful a history as that of Louis XV., and the horrors of the French Revolution, were inflicted on a great people without any intelligible causes. One of the chief of these was the inhuman and odious persecution which the devoted adherents of an austere and sublime creed met with from the day of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

ART. VIII.—*The Correspondence of the late Earl Grey with His Majesty King William IV., and with Sir Herbert Taylor, from Nov.* 1830 *to June* 1832. Edited by HENRY EARL GREY. 2 vols. 8vo. 1867.

THE first reflection excited by the perusal of these volumes in the minds of those who retain a personal remembrance of the times to which they relate, will be of rather a melancholy character. Those times are really so near our own; they seem so much nearer in memory; the passions of the old Reform days are still so vivid; but the men whose names are inseparably connected with them are shadows of the past. In that sense, the period in question has ceased to be contemporary with ours, and has become historical. All the chief actors, but one or two, have disappeared from the scene; and nearly all the secondary actors. The proportion of those who have thus vanished is certainly rather greater than the mere lapse of five and thirty years would seem *à priori* to render probable, were it not for the comparatively advanced age at which English statesmen, generally speaking, attain the highest positions. As it is, the visions called up by these pages, in which the characters of the drama are brought before us speaking their own language, form a phantasmagoria of the dead, almost as much as those evoked by narratives of the French Revolution. All the members of Lord Grey's original Cabinet, with one exception, have departed 'ad plures,' to the great silent majority. So have the leaders of Opposition, the Great Duke, Lord Lyndhurst, Peel, and the rest of them; Lord Ellenborough excepted. So have the chiefs alike of the advanced Liberals and of the Waverers and Malcontents, who played in their several ways so bustling a part outside the Cabinet. The King's children and other near connexions, who busied themselves so fruitlessly in retarding the movement of the time, and were supposed by keen politicians to be still more active than they really were, have all followed the sovereign to the grave. We meet, of course, here and there, with the names of statesmen at that time emerging into political life, and who now play a great part in it: but they were then beginners only. Two great performers—Lord Brougham and the Bishop of Exeter—though still surviving among us, have made their exit from affairs: it seems a singular caprice of destiny, that these two fiery hearts, among so many, should continue to burn on in protracted decline. But the only survivors among the front rank men of those days who continue

to maintain the same position now, are Lord Russell and Lord Derby. These, the two latest accessions to Lord Grey's Reform Cabinet, remain among us, to connect the past with the present by living tradition; and we have all a right to hope that they, who carried the first Reform Bill through all its stages, may continue to take a prominent part in those discussions which must precede the ultimate enactment of the new one, whatever end Fate may have in store for it.

In the meantime, these records of a former day, already, as we have said, become historical, bear with singular significance on what is passing under our eyes. They portray most vividly before us the state of mind into which the chief political leaders of 1831 were brought under the pressure of a fierce political crisis, when called on to confront chances which they could not calculate, and dangers the extent or reality of which they could only conjecture. We witness the protests, the wailings, the ineffectual struggles, of a great party, comprising the wealthiest and most powerful, and many of the wisest, members of the community, before the steady advance of an unrelenting destiny. We are rendered conscious of that truth which, indeed, every year of serious public difficulty impresses more and more forcibly on the mind—the utter insufficiency of those who pass in ordinary times as clever politicians, not only to conjure away a storm of this description, but to estimate in any degree its force or direction. The representatives and leaders of Society, such as we find it in the clubs of the West End, or in fashionable country-houses, or, often enough, among the highest circles of commerce—men who are for ever on the look-out for great results from small causes, and fancy the course of national politics about to change if a clever combination has been effected between this and that Parliamentary leader, or jealousy sown between this and that section of the House—those who really assume to imagine that the chain of events is forged in the studies of active wire-pullers, or the drawing-rooms of fair intriguers—all these, with their minute resources of state-craft, seem struck on such occasions as this with confusion of speech, like the builders of the Tower of Babel. Spirits of higher order than theirs, better fitted to comprehend the genius of the epoch, though seeing more distinctly their position, were then scarcely better able to turn their knowledge to account. They were struck blind for a season, and 'wearied themselves to find the door.' They could not get clear of the idea that there was still some way left for averting, or turning into a new channel, the movement which they dreaded, or putting off final decision until the

waves might abate. Not only their pride, but their consciousness of an ability often proved in minor conflicts, made them shrink from admitting the inevitable but humiliating conclusion, that when the popular hurricane has acquired a certain force, there is nothing left but to yield to it. Those who have lived through some great national crisis, like that of the first Reform Bill, may perchance have been reminded of it when watching a common spectacle for seaside loungers—the drawing of the seine on a beach. Onwards and shorewards, slowly but steadily, comes the net, pulled in by the regular efforts of a few sturdy, determined arms; within it, more and more visible as the machine approaches the land, we see the thousands of lithe, silvery creatures which it contains, leaping, floundering, and struggling in unavailing activity, as if by their irregular movements they could impede their approaching capture.

It would, however, be most unjust to speak contemptuously, or disparagingly, as a body, of the champions of resistance in that great debate. There were among them, in both Houses, mere adventurers—men of high ability, and totally emancipated from scruples, men who would have fought just as fiercely in one camp as the other, if chance had determined their position otherwise. And such men took, as they always will do, a more leading part than honester politicians, whose very honesty rendered them less self-confident. But there were men answering precisely the same description on the side of Reform also. And popular history, which loves the striking and the grotesque, has preserved the memory of these theatrical performers perhaps more vividly than that of the more earnest champions on either side. There were also, on the side of Opposition, combatants of that blind, haughty, arbitrary turn of disposition which wealth and rank are apt to nourish in narrow-minded men. And many more, whose chief actuating motive seems to have been a conceit of their own intellectual superiority, and a sneering contempt for the vulgar commonplaces of the popular side. But there was room for many also who belonged to the most invaluable class of British politicians: considerate, upright, self-controlling men, whose chief fault was perhaps that they made it too soon, and too resolutely, a point of honour not to give way before that liberalism against which they had once declared themselves: men whose hearts were full of real and generous sympathy with the unrepresented classes, whose enfranchisement they opposed only from a reluctant sense of its danger. They erred—in our judgment, that is—and chiefly for the simple reason which misleads most men in emergency—

'Perchè quando un gran periglio è presso,
Difficil molto è consigliar se stesso.'

But it would be most unjust to withhold from their courage and principle its meed of admiration, and not to recognise in them patriots who have done the State, in their way, almost as valuable service as those whom accidental circumstances, rather in many instances than a clearer judgment, enlisted in the party of progress.

Our own sympathies, as is well-known, are more engaged on the side of the supporters of Reform: the winning side as regarded the country, but the unpopular one with those classes to which they themselves belonged. There is no more trying position than that of the aristocratic leaders of a democratic movement. They have support cordial enough, and clamorous enough, from the multitude; but they know full well that these are called forth by the occasion, not the men; that the people, like Tennyson's 'Vivien,' call on their servants to 'love 'them all in all, or not at all;' and that the first faltering on their parts would be followed by desertion and contempt. They are well aware that the men of the strongest and most influential character among their supporters have views extending far beyond their own, and only make use of them, in their own belief at least, as agents for the accomplishment of greater ends. They cannot but know full well that they are regarded by the public as little more than tools in the hands of the great Power in the background—what Miss Martineau describes as 'the monstrous offspring of this strange time, vigilant, far-'spreading, intelligent, and of incalculable force; a power 'believed in its season to be greater than that of King, Lords, 'and Commons; there it sate, watching them all, and ready to 'take up any duty which any one of them let drop, and force 'it back into the most reluctant hands.' And if the Parliamentary leaders of a popular cause could be in the least degree blind to this class of truths, the continual taunts of their Conservative enemies would keep their eyes perforce open to them. They have to endure the indignation, the sneers, the affected pity, of the great majority of so-called 'society,' and to bear them without reply, because they admit of none. For what is alleged against them is true. They have abandoned the cause of their own order, where they were at home, and adopted that of the people, to whom, in the mass, they are and must remain strangers. The Tories of 1832 had the full right to point, in the face of the advisers of the Crown, to the flames of Bristol, to the ruins of Nottingham, to cowardly mobs insulting England's best and bravest, and to say, 'Thus

'diddest thou.' Such taunts were far harder to bear than the inflictions endured by the other side: the invectives of a coarse press, the hisses of an excited populace. They could only be borne in firm reliance on the verdict of the Future. But Time, the redresser of wrongs, has by the unanswerable logic of events, by the full *amende*, wrung in the next generation from the sons whose fathers had stoned the first Reformers, amply justified that reliance.

But whether our reader agrees in these opinions, or whether he is one of those who still hold that the last Reform Act was the beginning of the dissolution of all things, we are satisfied that he will not lay down these volumes without a higher respect both for the character and abilities of Lord Grey than he had before. There was something in the presence and character of that eminent man which ensured respect, but never commanded popularity. By great part of the public he was regarded as little more than the figure-head of the administration which bore his name: an impression which was by no means diminished by the reckless and pretentious vaunts of one or two of his associates. Others, who approached him nearer, estimated his ability much higher, but deemed him to have other disqualifications for the management of a great cause: likening him to Clarendon's description of St. John, 'a man 'reserved, and of a dark and clouded countenance, very proud, 'and conversing with very few, and those men of his own 'humour and inclination:' or, as a hostile poet described him,

> 'That chief, whose cold unyielding pride
> Not even success nor power could hide,
> Nor fall nor failure tame.'

Lord Grey had taken no share in the formation of Mr. Canning's Ministry in 1827, when several of his friends joined it. He had, on the contrary, bitterly attacked Mr. Canning, who was burning with eagerness to answer his assailant. He was left without political hope or following, and when in 1831 he stood at the head of the great national movement, a man of such a turn as his might have been expected to possess the power to rule, rather than the power to lead. But these letters contain nevertheless abundant proof of the masterly manner in which he did lead his Cabinet, and really controlled the impatient, as well as the sluggish, minds of his various subordinates. They show also how completely he was the indispensable director of the whole business, so far as regarded one of its most important branches, the management of the Sovereign. Certainly none of his associates could have dealt with William IV.

as Lord Grey did: imposing on him by his personal dignity, disarming petulance by his never-failing courtesy, and bringing the affair steadily onward by unswerving pertinacity. His was truly the grasp of steel in the silken glove. What his difficulties were, these same letters, veiling as they do many particulars in decent reticence, pretty effectually disclose. He had to keep the vacillating King up to the mark, and discomfit one after another all his schemes for evading or mitigating what he deemed revolution. He had to face, as well as he might, the perpetual court intrigue besetting his Sovereign, and the perpetual intrigues of society to try the steadiness of his supporters. In his own Ministry he could count, indeed, on the unvarying and persuasive honesty of an Althorp, and the warm-hearted championship of Lord John Russell; but he had also the daily task of urging on the indolent or half-hearted Canningites: while it was his business to resist alike the fierce impulse given to the machine by Lord Durham, and the eccentric movements of his mercurial Chancellor; and to keep concord, as far as might be, where two such spirits as these were in forced conjunction. Through all this chaos—such at least it at one time seemed, and such his opponents believed it—he made his way with singular composure. Though it is curious to trace, in this correspondence, how even this composure seemed at last to give way under the extreme virulence of his assailants; and how he, who took up the great experiment at first with every disposition to carry it into effect as gently and with as much of concession as practicable, warmed into obstinacy, almost into sternness, as the conflict grew fiercer. Those who supposed that Lord Grey could be intimidated by vehemence, or cowed by sarcasm, had certainly mistaken their man. The lavish employment of these weapons against him only irritated him when lukewarm, and strengthened him when undecided. The only points in the conflict at which his vigour seemed to relax were those at which opposition grew less violent, or softened into negotiation.

We notice that several critics of this correspondence have expressed themselves equally satisfied with the part which the King plays in the conduct of it; and think that his character is raised by its disclosures. In that opinion we can hardly concur. It is quite true, and should be proclaimed at the outset, that there is no trace whatever of anything to his dishonour. Even under the excited passions of that day, he was rarely charged with the exercise of duplicity towards his Ministers; and never with justice. He never swerved from the duty of giving them that constitutional support which is the duty of

a Sovereign towards his Ministers, nor was he fairly chargeable with counteracting that support by underhand intrigue. He was scrupulous in avoiding even the appearance of such conduct. This praise he deserves; but not, we think, much more, so far as he is exhibited in these pages. Except treachery only, of which he was incapable, he certainly threw every possible obstacle in the way of his Ministers, pledged as he was, in company with them, to a measure which he dreaded and detested. He was looking one way throughout, and rowing another. From the beginning to the end, we find him indulging in a perpetual querulous mood towards the Premier and his political friends. He always gives his Ministers credit for good intentions: is perfectly satisfied that they mean no evil to the constitution of the country; but equally satisfied that the constitution is going to pieces, and that those on whom they rely as supporters have no other object in view than the destruction of the whole political system. He is forced to accept, and even to echo, Lord Grey's denunciations of the violence and injustice of the Opposition, while it is evident enough that his heart is with the Opposition all the while. To Lord Grey's constant, though moderately worded, complaints of the misuse of the royal name by those persons who affected to speak on his authority when attacking his Ministers and taking exception to their measures, he replies sometimes by denial of the allegations, sometimes by assurances that he has been misrepresented; but we never find him taking the simple and straightforward course of banishing from his company these treacherous associates: and with good reason, since no one knew better than Lord Grey that the chief culprits were the King's own children and the nearest inmates of his household. On the whole, his demeanour and language, under the infliction of a Reform Ministry, remind one of nothing so much as the weak complaints of one who has surrendered himself to the guidance of companions too strong for him, and worries them with mournful inquiries whither they are taking him, and assurances that they have all got out of the right way together.

The merit, however, of the King's letters, considered merely as artistic compositions, appears to us very great. William IV. happened at that time to be impeded by rheumatism in the use of the pen; and none of them are written by himself. Nor indeed do we believe that he ever possessed enough of literary ability to have composed them. They are of two classes, rather oddly intermingled: first, those signed by the King and written in his name, all, apparently, by Sir Herbert

Taylor; presumably under the royal dictation, although here and there the reader seems to detect signs of assistance from some other quarter, or consultation with other parties: secondly, the notes written and signed by Sir Herbert Taylor in his own name; demi-official, in the conventional language of red tape; generally by way of postscript, or explanation, or softening, or strengthening, something in the King's own epistles; an inconvenient manner of conducting the correspondence for the Minister, who could never have felt perfectly sure when the favoured secretary spoke for himself, and when for his employer.

'I hope (says Sir Herbert in one of the earliest of these important notes, vol. i. p. 49) you will not think that I am exceeding the bounds of discretion in writing to your Lordship in these terms, or that I am guilty of any breach of that confidence which his Majesty is pleased to repose in me. I assure you that I should not feel the least objection to his Majesty's knowing that I have written this letter, or to his seeing it; but your Lordship will oblige me by considering it as addressed to yourself only.'

An intimation which must have left the receiver, as yet unaccustomed to the royal ways, in considerable doubt as to the real authorship.* One unpleasant circumstance Lord Grey must soon have detected: that this very intimate personage, who had the King's ear and held his pen—carefully as he might keep his personality in the background—was at least as staunch an anti-reformer as the King himself. But he was far too cautious, as well as too honourable a man, to allow his political partialities to seduce him into intrigue.

'After all (he says in one of his first letters to Lord Grey, Jan. 15, 1831) there was never any Court from which and of which so little could be told, which every servant in the house, from the highest to the lowest, could not tell. Their Majesties are accessible at all hours; the apartments are open to every one; there is no seclusion, no mystery, nothing to conceal. The King sees numbers of persons in the course of the day, and converses freely with them upon subjects on which they may give him information; but I am confident that, although he may listen to them, he never converses upon any matter which may be the subject of communication with his Government, or respecting ministerial or official arrangements in contem-

* We are bound, however, to add that the Editor says in his preface that the Ministers always found complete identity between the views stated in Sir H. Taylor's letters on behalf of the King, and those expressed verbally by his Majesty himself, in the frequent audiences in which he was accustomed to discuss public affairs with them.

plation. Politics are never the subject of conversation at dinner, or at evening parties; indeed, his Majesty professes not to allow it, and he never touches on the subject with the Queen, who indeed does not seem at all disposed to break through a rule so essential in such a society, and whose superior judgment and good sense would induce her to feel its importance, and to discourage any departure from it in others; even common articles of intelligence are not noticed otherwise than as conveyed in the newspapers.'

Regarded, however, merely as pieces of epistolary skill, both the King's (so-called) and Sir Herbert's letters are certainly admirable. The writer has in general achieved the very difficult task of conveying his meaning distinctly without abruptness, or harshness, or smartness, or anything which could convey offence; and with a serious courtliness of style befitting the gravity of the occasion. They are of the highest palatial order; colourless, but clear, urbane, and business-like.

These letters, commencing with the assumption of office by Lord Grey, do not throw any light on the topic of the original conception of the Reform Bill of 1831. This is a subject to which recent events have a little recalled observation. We are induced to allude to it by the following letter from the present Earl Grey, which appeared in the 'Times' of March 9th last:—

'Sir,—A letter from Lord Brougham published in "The Times" of Monday last contains the following passage:—

"The true course is to give household suffrage. I proposed this "at the end of 1829, just before the change of Government, and it "was agreed to by the whole Liberal party present at our private "meeting—Lords Grey, Lansdowne, Radnor, and Lord John Russell "among the rest."

'I feel bound to deny the accuracy of this statement so far as it regards my father, and I think Lord Brougham's memory must deceive him as to any such meeting as he refers to having taken place in 1829. The only meeting held about that time by the Whig party on the subject of Reform, of which I am aware, or of which I can learn anything from Lord Russell, was one of the members of the House of Commons at Lord Althorp's rooms in the Albany, in the autumn of 1830, to consider a Bill Lord Brougham then contemplated bringing forward in the House of Commons. My father was not at this meeting, which came to no conclusion. I have Lord Russell's authority for saying that those who attended it came away unpledged.

'Whether there was any other meeting of the Whig leaders about Reform in 1829 or 1830 I do not know; but if there was I never heard of it, and I can most positively assert that it was not attended by my father.

'Though I have no doubt of the correctness of my own recollection on this subject, I have thought it right to defer addressing this

letter to you till I could communicate with Lord Radnor as well as with Lord Russell. Having done so, I now learn that Lord Radnor says there was no such meeting as that mentioned by Lord Brougham at which he was present.'

In a subsequent letter (March 15) Lord Brougham corrects himself as to the date. The meeting, he says, was held in Lord Althorp's chambers in the Albany, in 1830. Whether the members of the Whig party present at it 'assented' to the proposals of Lord Brougham (then newly elected for Yorkshire), is in dispute between his Lordship and Lord Russell. But the proposal itself is thus described by the Rev. Mr. Molesworth, in the first chapter of his 'History of the Reform Bill,' for which he claims Lord Brougham as an authority:—

'Lord Brougham had, as soon as the House assembled, and before the Speaker had even read the Speech from the throne, given notice of his intention to introduce a Bill to carry out his pledge (to the electors of Yorkshire). His plan had been submitted to a large meeting of members, and had been approved by them. He proposed to give votes to all copyholders, leaseholders, and householders; to give members to Manchester, Glasgow, Leeds, Sheffield, and other large towns; to deprive each nomination borough of one of its representatives; to disfranchise the outvoters in towns, but not in counties; to allow freemen in towns to vote if they had resided for six months; to reduce the time of elections to a single day; and, perhaps, to limit the number of members in the House to five hundred.' (*Molesworth*, ch. i.)

See also Mr. Roebuck's History, vol. i. p. 420, where it is said that 'the plan Mr. Brougham intended to propose was 'communicated formally to the Whig party on Saturday, 'November 13th, and was very generally known and openly 'canvassed.' He then subjoins it, in much the same terms as Mr. Molesworth, on the authority of a 'MS. of Lord 'Brougham.' In a debate on April 14, 1831 (he adds) the Lord Chancellor, speaking of his own plan, said of it—

'There is no such mighty difference between my project for Reform and the plan matured by Ministers. That plan went considerably farther than that now under consideration. I certainly do not mean to say that it proposed to disfranchise all these boroughs; but this I will say, that with respect to the extension of the franchise to inhabitant householders, the Bill lately introduced falls far short of that plan.'*

---

* Mirror of Parliament, 1831. It is singular that in the report in Hansard (which seems to be authenticated by the words 'Lord 'Brougham spoke as follows') the passage is quite different, and stands simply thus:—'He concurred in the present measure, . . .

Such are Lord Brougham's original views on the subject, as reported by himself. It seems clear, nevertheless, that he came to be regarded, during the struggle itself, as one of the less democratic portion of the Cabinet. He certainly was considered as having been rather a reluctant convert to the ten pound franchise, and preferring to fix it at twenty. Mr. Roebuck, who wrote his History in frequent communication with Lord Brougham, speaks (when reporting a speech of Sir E. Sugden) of the Lord Chancellor as 'asserted to be particularly 'displeased by the ten pound franchise.' In his speech on the second reading, October 7, 1831 (as published in the collected edition of his speeches), Lord Brougham says, 'An 'opinion has been broached that the qualification might be 'varied in different places, raised in the larger towns and 'lowered in the smaller. *To this I myself, at one time, leaned 'very strongly.* I deemed it a great improvement of the mea-'sure.' He could not *at that 'time'* have been a supporter of household suffrage. Nor was he regarded as more attached to other Radical features of the Bill. On January 24, 1831, Lord Grey writes to Lord Durham (just at the time when the plan of Reform was submitted to William IV.):—

'I find from Althorp that there is likely to be more difficulty than I thought about Reform. Upon his saying to Brougham that he was glad to find there was so great a concurrence of opinion, he answered that he had great objection to the abolition of close boroughs ; that they were by no means the worst parts of the representation ; that there would be no means for getting seats for persons in the Government, &c. He had hinted at this in the general discussion ; but had been satisfied by my answer, that, whatever the inconvenience might be, these boroughs could not be maintained. On this point I cannot give way. If he perseveres, he may throw us over with the King.'

We do not profess to reconcile all these contradictions ; but, on the whole, the evidence seems to show that whatever views the great popular lawyer may have entertained when framing a Reform Bill of his own in the wild freedom of Opposition, he had no strong taste either for the enfranchising or disfranchising portion of it when he became acquainted with the responsibilities of office. And, in the early period of the administration, he seems to have been regarded at Court as the mainspring of some possible future arrangement, under which Lord Grey

---

'and he formerly brought forward a more confined measure, because 'he thought that what he then proposed was the utmost of what 'he would then get ; he had since, however, overcome his first re-'luctance,' &c. (Vol. iii. p 184, col. 1341.)

might be dispensed with, and Reform postponed by a side blow.

'I believe (says a well-informed diarist of the orthodox Whig persuasion, whose MS. we have before us,* March 27, 1851, immediately after the second reading of the Reform Bill in the Commons,) that in spite of these sacrifices (on the Civil List question) things are not quite safe at Court. The Begums, including the Queen and the Princesses and the Princes, are all in the greatest alarm, and urging the King not to consent to a dissolution. Their plan is not for a complete change, but for retaining Brougham and some others, if they will remain. Brougham being at the levee last Thursday with a great bundle of Reform petitions, made some apology for intruding them on the King, who replied, "Never mind, Lord Brougham, I will take anything from you but the Seals."'

If Lord Brougham was popular just at this moment at head quarters, the reverse was certainly the case with his rival, Lord Durham. In the same month (March 1831) Lord Grey had communicated to the King an energetic letter from Lord Durham, urging a dissolution in the event of a defeat on the second reading. This letter seems to have excited the royal displeasure; and Lord Grey in excusing the freedom of the communication, adds—

'I have been induced to dwell more upon this because I have remarked that his Majesty's manner to Lord Durham has not been marked with the same kindness which he has shown to his other servants. This may have been accidental, but I know it has been felt by Lord Durham; and I had some thought of desiring him to address directly to his Majesty, from himself, a statement of his feelings and opinions on the question we have been discussing; which few people could do more ably, and which I hoped might bring about more confidential communications between his Majesty and a most useful and attached servant.'

Sir Herbert's answer, on this particular point, is cautious, but significant:—

'I think I may venture to say, and indeed I have the King's authority for saying, that your Lordship has mistaken the cause of his Majesty's manner towards Lord Durham, and that the appearance has been purely accidental. He observed, indeed, when I read that part of your letter to him, that Lord Durham appears shy and

* To avoid confusion it is proper to mention that in writing this article we shall have occasion to refer to two manuscript records of the time which have not been published; the one written by a decided member of the Whig party, the other by a person whose opinions inclined to the moderate Conservative side, and who was more connected with the Opposition than with the Government.

reserved, and that his manner does not encourage free intercourse.' (Vol. i. p. 205.)

We must pass rapidly, as in fact this correspondence does, over the history of Lord Grey's first Reform Bill, from its introduction in March 1831, to the defeat of Government on General Gascoyne's motion, April 18. Then it was that, after a struggle on the King's part, the power to dissolve was at length conceded to Lord Grey (contingently) in a letter which appears to us one of the best in the collection, and full alike of dignity and good sense, although Sir Herbert is forced by the necessity of the case to adopt conclusions which seem strangely at variance with the premises which conduct him to them.

'The apprehensions which his Majesty entertains must be strong indeed not to be removed, as indeed they have not been removed, by these assurances and opinions, submitted by individuals whose conduct, under the pressure of the difficulties in which they undertook and have continued to discharge the duties of their responsible situations, has so well merited his Majesty's confidence. He therefore owes it to his own character, he owes it to his claim to consistency, to state, fairly and without reserve, the considerations which have, upon due reflection, led him to waive his objections to a dissolution, or rather to subscribe to it, as the lesser of two evils.

'The King does not deny that, in his general view of the situation and of the interests of this country, of its foreign relations, and of the influence of the state of the Continent, by reaction, upon the tranquillity and the prosperity of this country, he attaches the greatest and an almost paramount importance to the stability of his Government, and to the maintenance of a fixed system of policy, which shall inspire confidence at home and abroad. He feels deeply the mischiefs which must result, the danger which may arise, from the frequent change of men and measures ; and these considerations have induced him to abandon his objections to much which, in less perilous times, might, in his opinion, have justified his adopting and pursuing a different course. His Majesty has deemed it due to himself to make this candid declaration, and he trusts that Earl Grey and his other confidential servants will not view it as betraying any diminution of the confidence which he has not ceased to repose in them, or of his sense of their valuable services.

'The King cannot close this letter without reminding Earl Grey that one of his objections to a dissolution was, that, in the present temper of the people, those who should offer themselves for their representatives might be called upon to pledge themselves to the support of proceedings greatly exceeding any measure of Reform contemplated by his Government, or to which the King could have been induced, *under the pressure of any circumstances*, to give his sanction ; and his Majesty having waived his general objections, expects that he may rely with confidence upon his Government for the most strenuous and firm resistance and opposition to any attempt

to introduce and carry measures which would extend the principle of the present Reform Bill, or which should have the effect of impairing the influence and dignity of the Crown, and of curtailing the constitutional rights of the monarchy.

'His Majesty indeed considers that, if the result of a general election should give to his Government a decided preponderance in the House of Commons, advantage should be taken of it, not to re-establish the Bill in its original shape, but to introduce such modifications as, without producing any essential departure from the principle of the measure, shall be calculated to conciliate the opponents of the Bill, and to reconcile the *general* opinion and feeling of the country to it. He considers the framers of the Bill to be pledged to those modifications of it which Earl Grey has stated to his Majesty, in detail, that they were prepared to introduce, and that he was willing to admit; and his Majesty conceives also that every attention should be paid to the production of correct returns of population, in order to remove the objections which have justly been made to the inaccuracy of calculations founded upon the census of 1821, which has in many instances been shown to be defective, and therefore inapplicable.'

Then followed the famous dissolution of April, 1831: an event of no small historical importance in itself, but better remembered in these times from the strange and almost grotesque circumstances connected with it. The newspaper controversy on the subject of those circumstances between the present Lord Grey and the Rev. Mr. Molesworth, author of a 'History of the Reform Bill,' will be fresh in the recollection of some of our readers. Mr. Molesworth, it will be remembered, declared that his own version of the transaction was derived from materials furnished by Lord Brougham. The same story, substantially, is told, to all appearance from the same authority, by Mr. Roebuck (History of the Whig Ministry, vol. ii. p. 148):—

'On the morning of the 22nd (he says), Lord Grey *and the Lord Chancellor waited* on the King, in order to request that he would instantly, and on that day, dissolve the House. The whole scene of this interview of the King and his Ministers, as related by those who could alone describe it, is a curious illustration of the way in which the great interests of mankind often seem to depend on petty incidents, and in which ludicrous puerilities often mix themselves up with events most important to the welfare of whole nations.'

He then proceeds to describe, most graphically, the 'intru-sion into the royal closet' of the '*two chiefs*' of the administration: how 'the bolder mind of the Lord Chancellor took the lead, and Lord Grey anxiously solicited him to manage the King on this occasion;' and how, finally, the King yielded to the Chancellor's forcible persuasion, 'cooled down and con-

'sented,' and proceeded, in person, to the House of Lords, where an extraordinary scene, often recounted, took place. That Mr. Roebuck employed in all good faith information which he deemed to be accurate, no one can doubt. But the romance crumbles away at once before serious investigation. The real story is told by the present Earl Grey in these volumes (i. 234). A letter, which has been lost, had been written to the King by Lord Grey on the evening of the 21st.

'The purport of the letter, as indeed is obvious from the King's answer to it, was to propose that the dissolution, to which the King had already assented, should take place the next day. The circumstances which led to this recommendation, and under which the letter was written, I can state from my own recollection, confirmed by that of Lord Halifax, who was my father's private secretary at the time.

'Although a dissolution had been decided upon, it was not intended that it should take place until some votes of money had been obtained, which were wanted to carry on the public service till a new Parliament could be assembled. But, on the evening of the 21st. notice was given in the House of Lords, by Lord Wharncliffe, that he would on the following day move an Address to the Crown against a dissolution of Parliament; and on the same evening the Opposition, in the House of Commons, showed their intention to prevent any vote of money from being obtained by the Government. Before the report of the votes in the Ordnance estimates, which had been passed in Committee of Supply, could be brought up, a long debate was raised upon a resolution respecting the Liverpool election, in which the conduct of the Government was vehemently attacked, especially with reference to the supposed intention of dissolving Parliament; and at last a motion for the adjournment of the House, without having received the report, was made and carried against the Ministers on a division. This defeat prevented the money already voted from being available to the Government. . . .

'In the meantime, and almost at the last moment, it was found necessary to make a further change in the mode of proceeding. By the law and usage of Parliament, the House of Lords is entitled to dispose of any business actually in progress, before it admits the Commissioners of the Crown; and it was ascertained that the Opposition Peers intended to avail themselves of this rule, so as to carry Lord Wharncliffe's proposed Address.

'It is quite true that their doing so would no more have deprived the Crown of its constitutional power to dissolve Parliament, than the addresses of the same character which were carried in the House of Commons, after the Coalition Ministry had been dismissed and succeeded by that of Mr. Pitt in 1784. It was, however, thought desirable to prevent the House of Lords from coming to such a vote, lest it should have a bad effect on public opinion.

'This could only be done by the King's going down to prorogue

Parliament in person, the appearance of the King in the House of Lords putting a stop to all proceedings. This course was accordingly proposed to the King by my father, at the audience which the King had previously fixed for half-past eleven on the morning of the 22nd, and at which Lord Brougham was present.

'The King at once agreed to what was proposed to him; indeed, my father told me at the time, and he more than once afterwards mentioned the same fact in the presence of myself and others, that notwithstanding his strong objection to a dissolution in the first instance, the King, when the measure had been decided upon, resented the attempt to impede it by an Address of the House of Lords, as an invasion of his prerogative, and was therefore not only ready, but eager to do what was necessary to put a stop to Lord Wharncliffe's motion. As till after my father and Lord Brougham had seen the King no orders had been, or could be, given for the usual preparations for his going in state, there was some difficulty in making them at such short notice. Lord Albemarle, who was in attendance upon the King as Master of the Horse, said that it would be hardly possible to get the state carriages ready so soon, and complained that there would not be time to plait the horses' manes. The King, however, insisted that any preparations which could not be completed in time should be dispensed with, and was reported to have said to Lord Albemarle that, if necessary, he would go down in a hackney-coach. I believe that this story, which was generally current at the time, was true. I know that the King did express, in the strongest manner, his determination to go to the House of Lords, however incomplete the preparations for the usual procession might be. The orders for the attendance of the Life Guards were so late, that the regiment at Knightsbridge which was to have lined the road, though it was turned out as quickly as possible, did not arrive till after the King was gone, and could only keep the ground for his return. This fact I learn from Sir T. Biddulph, who was then an officer of the regiment. I believe that the escort for the King could only be obtained in time by sending to the Horse Guards for the troop on guard there.' (P. 234.)

The substantial fact evidently is, that the King needed no such compulsion to perform this act of state as Mr. Roebuck, and others, have supposed. He had been as adverse as possible to a dissolution up to the last moment. But his spirit of self-assertion was at last roused by the violent conduct of the Opposition—the supposed manœuvres to stop the supplies in the Commons, and to delay the exercise of the prerogative in the Lords. His back was up, in vulgar phrase; and he went down to Parliament, to put an end to its existence, with as hearty good will as he would have led a ship into action. This not unnaturally puzzled observers, aware of his general dislike to the measure and repugnance to the yoke of his Ministers, but not aware of the special motives which at this season urged

him on. The following are reflections on it from the MS. journal of a very close observer of these events, who enjoyed the confidence of some of the political leaders, the second of the two Diarists to whom we have referred:—

'With all due allowance for the King's steadiness, his pledge to the Reform Bill and love of popularity, it is difficult to make out the sort of heartiness in which he appears to go into this measure. It was not necessary, for instance, that he should go and prorogue the Parliament in person, and it is a very unusual circumstance in the case of a dissolution. It is true that his going in person put an end to all debating in the House of Lords, and therefore to the carrying of Lord Wharncliffe's motion, which, they say, it is not clear that a Commission could have done. But when he sent for his chief coachman, and was informed that the state carriage and horses could not be ready, he exclaimed, "Well, if they are not ready, I shall go in a hackney-coach." He spoke the whole way to Lord Albemarle, the Master of the Horse, with great animation and spirit. He dined the same evening at the Duchess of Kent's, where Lord and Lady Lansdowne and the Abercrombies were; and when the Duke of Cumberland after dinner put the conversation on what had passed in the House of Lords, he made a sign to Colonel Conroy, who rang the bell for coffee, and they all rose to proceed to the drawing-room.'

The hot fit, however, under which the dissolution was resolved on and performed by his Majesty, soon left the patient; a cold fit of more than usual severity succeeded. At that period, probably, if he had continued as resolute after he left Parliament as when he went down to it, the neck of opposition would have been broken. The most zealous anti-reformers would have felt the impossibility of carrying on the struggle longer against an united king and nation, however strongly they might have been convinced that reason was on their side. Unfortunately it was not so. Immediately after this exercise of sovereign will, the King's fears and scruples returned on him with redoubled force. He (or those who dictated for him) sought only to explain away and excuse the act which he had just done, and to warn his Ministers not to regard it as an indication of permanent policy. Rather they were exhorted to make the best use of the respite now afforded, by seeking to modify the measure to be submitted to the new Parliament in the way best calculated to disarm Tory opposition.

'The King cannot help considering this measure as an experiment—as a fearful experiment, which the general circumstances and the general considerations to which he has alluded could alone have justified his risking; and it is incumbent on him to urge upon the attention of his confidential servants all that can, in his

opinion, tend to lessen that risk. . . . A respite has been obtained; time is given for consideration and for revision. The Bill has been withdrawn. It may be remodelled, and advantage may be taken, in this interval, of all that has been said and written, to correct whatever may have been shown to be objectionable, to amend the details without abandoning the principle of the Bill. . . . The times are awful. . . . The King considers this state of things the more lamentable and the more alarming as it cannot be traced, in England at least, to any reasonable cause. It is therefore the more difficult to know where to find, and how to apply, the remedy. The sanguine advocates of Reform in Parliament, indeed, assure his Majesty that this will prove the grand panacea. God grant it may! and his Majesty will bless the day on which he gave his assent to the measure. But he repeats, he views it as an experiment; and his anxiety to assure, as far as possible, the success of that experiment, has induced him to make this full communication of his sentiments and feelings to Earl Grey and his confidential servants; and to urge, as he has done, the importance of taking every step that can tend to reconcile jarring interests and opinions.'*

He wanted delay till people's minds were calmed—he wanted a new census—anything, in short, that might put off the evil day. Lord Grey was, of course, calm and courteous—promised to revise the Bill before its reintroduction—but took very good care not to commit himself either to a policy of indefinite delay, or to the slightest intimation of essential change. One very mischievous change, indeed, seems to have been made at this time to conciliate opponents—the retention of freemen on the electoral lists.†

During the long debates in the new House of Commons on the second Reform Bill, the correspondence is brief, and not very instructive. It is curious to observe the very different relative importance of events in contemporary eyes and in those of another time. The successful carrying of the 'Chandos 'Clause' by the Opposition is the circumstance which, according to one class of politicians, made the Reform Bill a safe measure: according to another class, mutilated it irretrievably. We have not noticed that it is at all referred to in these pages either by the King or the Minister.

The chief interest of the fight was now transferred to the Lords. After much consultation of the Opposition leaders under the guidance of the Duke of Wellington,‡ the House

---

* The King to Earl Grey. April 24, 1831.

† See vol. lx. of this Journal, p. 250.

‡ 'At the Duke's dinner' (writes a contemporary), 'there were sixteen or seventeen; all the chief anti-reformers of the Peers.

threw out the second reading of the second Bill, on October 7, 1831, by 199 to 158. Lord Grey immediately tendered his resignation: the King pressed on him the retention of office. This the Minister could only accede to on the promise of distinct proofs of support, not in words only but in such deeds as might carry conviction to others: and the dismissal of Lord Howe, who had voted against the second reading, from the Queen's household, was one of the most indispensable of these, though so much felt at Court that Lord Grey terms it a 'distressing occasion.'

Of one episode of the Reform agitation, which occurred at this period, the editor says that 'it is not without hesitation 'that he has allowed the letter (in which it is noticed) to ap- 'pear in its place.' This was the speech of Colonel Napier (Sir William) to a meeting at Devizes; which so excited the anger of the King, that he proposed to strike the Colonel off the half-pay list, and was (probably) diverted from so strong a measure only by the personal representations of Lord Grey: 'I have, on the whole,' says the editor, 'thought it better not 'to suppress a letter which affords a striking illustration of 'the manner in which the difficulties encountered by the 'Ministry in passing the Reform Bill were aggravated by 'the violence of some of its supporters, and the bad effect this 'had on the mind of the King.' 'Earl Grey will observe,' says his Majesty, 'that Colonel Napier is a very *sweeping* 'enemy to all Government and established authority.' But neither King nor Minister was probably aware of what we now know, from Sir William's published correspondence, that in consequence of that speech he was invited by the more advanced leaders of the movement to take the command of the 'National Guard' of the future, and only declined — such was the embittered state of his political feelings—rather on personal than on public grounds.

They agreed to oppose the second reading. Lord Dudley, who was there, said it was tragedy first, and farce afterwards; for Eldon and Kenyon, who had dined with the Duke of Cumberland, came in after dinner. Chairs were placed for them on each side of the Duke, and after he had explained to them what they had been discussing, and what had been agreed upon, Kenyon made a long speech, by which it was soon apparent that he was very drunk, for he talked exceeding nonsense, wandered from one topic to another, and repeated the same thing over and over again. When he had done, Eldon made a speech on the second reading, and appeared to be equally drunk; only Kenyon in his drunkenness talked nonsense, but Eldon sense.'

Parliament was prorogued, October 18. And now the general discontent vented itself in that series of local disturbances which was long remembered as among the most alarming features of the time, and which culminated in the terrible Bristol riots at the end of October. Mr. Roebuck's remarks on this unhappy event appear to us to deduce from it the correct historical lesson:—

'Looking back now, when the mischief has been long repaired, we can estimate the great use of that solemn experience. It concentrated into one incident many of the horrors of revolutionary violence, and seriously alarmed the thinking men of all parties; and thus disposed them to look with complacency upon the modes of compromise which were suggested during the subsequent discussion; and, eventually, in no small degree contributed to the peaceful solution of the very difficult problem which the Reform Bill propounded to the practical wisdom of the statesmen of all parties.' *

The views of the King, or rather of his 'entourage,' were simpler:—

'The objects of the rioters at Bristol,' says Sir Herbert Taylor to Lord Grey, November 7, 'were plunder and destruction; those of the Assembly which had been convened for this day (the Bristol Political Union) were revolutionary and treasonable; and Reform in Parliament must be considered as forming a very insignificant portion of such acts and projects. . . . This may be applied equally to the Unions at Birmingham and elsewhere. Those which existed before the change of government had been formed for purposes highly objectionable and illegal—namely, to raise the prices and wages of work and labour in the manufacturing towns and districts. That at Birmingham, though dignified with the higher-sounding title of Political Union, was connected with the former, and was understood to partake of their character.' †

It seems singular, to our modern notions, that a Political Union should be censured as illegal, because its covert objects are those of a Trades' Union; but the world has learnt a good many lessons on this particular subject since 1831.

In connexion with the alarm just at this time prevalent, we may notice a little by-event, which occurred in November, 1831, and which illustrates to a certain extent the character both of the Duke of Wellington and the King. The Duke of Wellington thought proper to address a letter, personally, to his Majesty, pointing out the great dangers to which in his apprehension the country was exposed by the violence of the Political Unions.‡

* History, vol. ii. p. 235. † Vol. i. p. 407.

‡ Neither this letter nor the correspondence which afterwards ensued upon it, says the editor, can be found. Vol. i. p. 415.

The Duke himself thus refers to the circumstance in a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, January 2, 1832.*

'When I wrote to the King in November, on the armament of the political associations, I had in hand a case upon which I was certain that nineteen-twentieths of the country would concur with me. I did it likewise at a period of the year when I knew that *if the King wished to get rid of the bonds in which he is held, I could assist him in doing so.* There was time to call a new Parliament, and the sense of the country would have been taken on a question on which there could be no doubt. What did the King do? He concurred in (I may say without exaggeration) every opinion which I gave him. His Ministers saw their scrape, and prevailed upon the press and the political associations to alter their course. They issued a mock proclamation, and promised the King a Bill to repress these associations, which promise they never performed; and the King is quite satisfied, and goes on with them as well as ever!'

The fact as detailed in this correspondence was, that the King had in the most constitutional manner communicated the Duke's letter, and his own answer to it, at once to Lord Grey. He seems to have been in a courageous humour; for both he and his confidential secretary make rather light of the Duke's alarms. Lord Grey says, 'I never was more surprised 'than at reading these productions, the object of which cannot 'be misunderstood, and the propriety and constitutional cha-'racter of them appear to me more than questionable: at least 'I think nothing could have induced me, under similar circum-'stances, to have had recourse to such a proceeding.' The King justifies both the Duke and himself, as well as he can; the one against Lord Grey's censure for writing the letter, the other against his Lordship's respectful remonstrance on account of his having answered it without first consulting his Ministers. Of the promise to bring in a Bill to put down the Unions, alleged by the Duke, we have not noticed any trace in this correspondence. The King, evidently, contrived to offend both parties, and be looked upon by both with suspicion. Yet there was no real double-dealing in the case; only the incurable weakness which is apt to show itself in assent to each reasoner in turn. 'Letters that the Duke wrote to a great personage,' says Lord Eldon, 'produced the proclamation against the 'Unions. But if Parliament will not interfere farther, the 'proclamation will be of little use: I think, no use.'†

The immediate effect, however, of the terror and discourage-

* Courts and Cabinets of William IV. and Victoria, vol. i. p. 384.

† Dec. 8, 1831. Twiss's Life of Eldon, ch. lv.

ment inspired by these disturbances was the sudden rise, 'like 'an exhalation,' of the party of the 'Waverers,' between the two exasperated leading factions. All great political struggles have their Cave of Adullam; but in the instance now before us, the constituencies were too much in earnest, and the fight too close, to allow of such eccentricities among the Commons. The Adullamites of 1831 were Peers and had been Conservatives.

'There is always,' philosophises Miss Martineau concerning the Waverers, 'such a set of people in such times; and greatly do they always embarrass the calculations of the best informed. These kept the issue in uncertainty up to the last moment. On the one part were the honest and enlightened peers who saw that the end of borough corruption was come. On the other part were the honest and unenlightened, or the selfish, who would not have our institutions touched on any pretence whatever; and between them now stood the Waverers, hoping to keep things as they were, but disposed to yield voluntarily, if they could not conquer, rather than be put down by force of numbers.'*

We extract the following account of the promising hopes which attended the outset of this party from the second MS. journal from which we have already given extracts: that of one who was not only an attentive observer, but himself closely conversant with its schemes, and much consulted by its leaders. Nevertheless, we must be permitted to doubt, especially with this correspondence before us, whether his friends did not count, far more than they were justified in doing, on the concessions which they imagined they might expect from Lord Grey.

'Yesterday morning (Nov. 19, 1831) I called on Lord Wharncliffe. He was sitting before a heap of papers; and when I told him this (something which the narrator had learned from the Duke of Richmond) he laughed, and said that Richmond was behindhand; that matters had gone a great deal farther than this; and then proceeded to give me the following account of what had passed some time ago.'

He then gives a story of some overtures for a compromise alleged to have been made by Lord Palmerston, and their reception by Lords Wharncliffe and Harrowby; and of negotiations with Lord Grey himself which followed.

'In this state the matter stood yesterday morning, apparently with every prospect of being arranged. Wharncliffe had already spoken to Dudley, Lyndhurst, and De Ros, the only peers of the party he had seen, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who were

* History of the Thirty Years' Peace, p. 356.

delighted at what had passed. He had written to the Duke of Wellington and Peel, and he is busying himself in consulting and communicating with all the peers and influential commoners of the party whom he can find in town. The terms are not yet settled; but the general basis agreed upon seems to be this. The concession of schedule A, of representatives to the great towns, and a great extension of the county representation, on one side; the abandonment, or nearly so, of schedule B; such an arrangement with regard to the 10*l.* qualification, as shall have the practical effect of a higher rate; and an understanding that the manufacturing interest is not to have a preponderating influence in the county representation. . . . A great deal to be left open to discussion, especially on all the subordinate points. Such is the history of this curious transaction, which affords a triumphant justification of the course which the Opposition adopted; indeed Palmerston admitted to Wharncliffe that their tactics had been entirely judicious. It is likewise a great homage rendered to character, for Wharncliffe has neither wealth, influence, nor superior abilities, nor even popularity with his own party. He is a spirited, sensible, zealous, honourable, consistent country-gentleman. Their knowledge of his moderation and integrity induced Ministers to commit themselves to him, and he will thus be in all probability enabled to render an essential service to his country, and be a principal instrument in the settlement of a question the continued agitation of which would have been perilous in the extreme.'

Such was the first exultation of a clever member of the political world over these negotiations: one who, though opposed to the Reform movement, thought that the time was come to carry the Bill, and who hoped that it would be carried by a compromise which might avert the necessity of having recourse to extreme measures, but who had forgotten, apparently, that the nation must be an indispensable party to such a compact.

'I could not indeed, in my view of what had passed (says Lord Grey to Sir H. Taylor, Dec. 13, 1831), describe what had taken place between Lord Wharncliffe and me as a negotiation; still less could I assent to our communications, of whatever description they might be, being understood to have proceeded upon the principle of compromise and mutual concession. I certainly could in no case have entered into any discussion upon the Reform Bill, except upon the ground expressly admitted by Lord Wharncliffe, of my obligation to maintain the principle and efficiency of the measure.'*

Lord Grey, had he been ever so inclined, could not have acted otherwise in the then spirit of his colleagues and the

* The authentic account of the interchange of proposals between Lord Grey and Lord Wharncliffe will be found in Appendix B and C to the first volume of this correspondence.

nation. Lord Wharncliffe and his friends could only make a certain show of attack on the outworks of the fabric of Reform, the stronghold remaining unassailable. The alterations introduced by Ministers in their third Reform Bill were in reality unimportant.

The hopes and fears inspired by these *pourparlers* were therefore of short duration. By the beginning of 1832, Ministers were persuaded that no substantial defection from the Opposition to their third Bill was to be expected in the Lords; and that it was in imminent danger on the second reading. It was then that they were driven to propose to the King the formidable measure of 'swamping' the House of Lords, by a new creation of peers, to the imminent danger of the permanent annihilation of its constitutional powers.

This proposal was formally made to the King in a cabinet minute of January 15, 1832. Great part of the second volume of this work is occupied with the correspondence on this subject between him and his Ministers. The King's opposition to it, sometimes dignified, sometimes querulous, is maintained through many letters. And on this point—and this only, throughout the correspondence—the fibre of Lord Grey himself seems occasionally to have relaxed. He evidently hopes to the last moment for some issue out of the existing perplexities without having actual recourse to the permission on which he is forced to insist as indispensable. His tone is subdued and nearly apologetic, like that of one who insists on the necessity of some painful operation, prescribed by others rather than himself, and concerning the success of which he has his own misgivings. His shrinking from the task was evident to all observers. See, especially, his letter to Lord Althorp, of March 11, 1832, which seems almost to amount to a deliberate renunciation of the project. In the gossip of that day, it was rumoured that he had fallen under the social influence of some one or more of those fair politicians, who never played so brilliant or so distracting a part as during the Reform Bill agitation, at least since the days of the Fronde. Others, probably with much better reason, ascribed his hesitation partly to weariness of the long struggle, partly to constitutional principle, partly to ingrained attachment to his 'order.' Probably the pending negotiations with Lord Wharncliffe and his followers may have had something to do with the matter. The internal divisions of the Cabinet on this question are thus described by our Diarist:—

'The upshot of the matter is this. The question about the Peers is

still under consideration ; Lord Grey and the ultra party want to make a dozen now ; the others five or six. . . . The moderate party in the Cabinet consist of Lansdowne, Richmond, Palmerston, Melbourne, and Stanley ; Palmerston and Melbourne, particularly the latter, are now heartily ashamed of the part they have taken about Reform. They detest and abhor the whole thing ; and they find themselves unable to cope with the violent party, and consequently complicated in a continued series of measures which they disapprove ; and they do not know what to do, whether to stay in and fight the battle, or to resign. . . . As to Lord Grey, it is exceedingly difficult to understand his real sentiments, and to reconcile his present conduct with the tenor of his former professions. That he was averse to the adoption of so violent a measure I have no doubt. His pride and aristocratic principle would naturally make him so ; but he is easily governed, constantly yielding to violence and intimidation, and it is not unlikely that the pertinacity of those about him, and the interests of his party, and the prolongation of his power, may induce him to sacrifice his natural feelings and opinions.'

There was nothing to reconcile and nothing to explain: Lord Grey, like other men, was carried along by the current of events, and, in the then state of public feeling, known to him and his associates far better than to his opponents, he had learnt to contemplate the use of means towards the attainment of his paramount end which he had at first regarded with aversion. 'Lord Grey is a great reformer short of his order,' says our Whig friend, already quoted; 'but when it comes to 'the House of Lords, he refuses the leap. Take it he must, 'however, some time or other.'

But the danger of Ministers having recourse to this new and double-edged weapon seemed for the moment averted. On April 9th the debate on the second reading in the Lords began ; it passed on the 14th by a majority of nine. Lord Harrowby and Lord Wharncliffe had wrought effectually on the scruples of some fair men, and some timid men. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and some other spiritual peers, held out hopes that they would join the secession, though they afterwards abandoned it. Seventeen of the former opponents came over to Government, under the leadership of the two lords aforesaid: ten were absent. They all earned thereby the soundest abuse from those who remained staunch, and that without having gained a single substantial point ; the Duke of Wellington especially bitterly resented their interference with the paramount authority he exercised over the whole Tory party; they did not succeed in rescuing by negotiation one rotten borough, and simply held on in vain hopes of doing something in Committee. How fierce the mutual feelings were between

the two sections of these quondam associates may be partly inferred from the following account of the speech of one of the chiefs of the obstinate party, the Bishop of Exeter:—'Full of fire and venom; very able. It would be an injury 'to compare this man with Laud: he more resembles Gardiner. 'Had he lived in those days, he would have been just such 'another: boiling with ambition; an ardent temperament and 'great talents; he has a desperate and a dreadful countenance, 'and looks like the man he is.' When, however, the second reading had been carried, the seceders who had effected the change were soon deeply dissatisfied with their own success. They had succeeded in carrying the second reading of the Bill, and thereby averted the immediate creation of Peers, which would probably have taken place if the Bill had been thrown out by the House of Lords; but they failed to obtain any modification of the Bill itself. After the division on the second reading they therefore sank back into insignificance.

'The Harrowby and Wharncliffe party (says their ally), now that the second reading is over, ceases to be a party. It was a patched-up miscellaneous concern at best, of men who were half reasoned and half frightened over, who could not bear separating from the Duke, long to return to him, and besides are ashamed of Wharncliffe as a chief. There never was such a *chef de circonstance;* he is a very honest man, with a right view of things and a fair and unprejudiced understanding, but commanding little deference, and in a false position as the ephemeral leader he is!'

And now followed the concluding, and by far the strangest, scenes of this long drama. Ministers were early warned that their victory was likely to be temporary only.

'The restored confidence of the public (writes Lord Grey to Sir H. Taylor, April 18, 1832) by the passing of the second reading will give me much more liberty as to alterations in the Committee; and I am sincerely disposed, for the purpose of conciliation, to adopt any to which I can assent with honour. If the same disposition exists on the part of Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe, I shall have the most sanguine hope of being able to bring this long-pending question to a satisfactory termination. But I have had accounts of communications between Lord Wharncliffe and Lords Lyndhurst and Ellenborough which are calculated to throw some doubt on their good intentions in Committee.'

A new storm was evidently brewing; and it soon burst. On May 17th the Opposition obtained a majority of thirty-five in Committee, on a motion of Lord Lyndhurst for postponing disfranchisement to enfranchisement. The Waverers in general once more chopped round, and voted with the Opposition.

'The whole plan was evidently concocted (says Lord Grey to the King, May 7) by Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe, with Lords Lyndhurst and Ellenborough, and I have no doubt sanctioned by the Duke of Wellington, though I do not see how it is possible for his Grace to consent to the plan of Reform announced to the House after the division by Lord Ellenborough. . . . He took care not to let his plan be known to the House before the division, which would, I believe, have been very different if it had been previously announced. I make no remark on this proceeding, or on the conduct of Lords Harrowby and Wharncliffe in concerting it after their communication with me, and without giving me any notice of it. The only point we shall have to consider to-morrow would be whether we should propose a creation of peers, or at once tender our resignations to his Majesty.'

The course of this last and somewhat frivolous intrigue against the Reform Bill has never been very fully explained: perhaps is not worth explaining. It is certain that Lord Lyndhurst, while much dreaded and courted for his abilities, was at this time thoroughly distrusted on both sides. It had been predicted (falsely as it turned out) that he would vote for the second reading. His clever consort—the first Lady Lyndhurst—was painted as 'full of resentment and pique 'against the Opposition and the Duke.' Our Diarist, only a month or two before the proposal of the famous amendment, had 'thought him undecided,' 'that he had always had a han-'kering after Lord Grey and the Whigs; and had expressed 'himself in very unmeasured terms upon the Duke's blunders, 'and the impossibility of his being again Prime Minister.' The Whigs, on the other hand, always regarded him as a political apostate. 'If,' says our Diarist of that party, 'the 'motion of Lord Lyndhurst were not concerted with the Court, 'why did the King, of all men, send for Lord Lyndhurst, the 'chief judge of a supreme court, a man of broken fortunes, of 'the worst political character, a bitter enemy to Reform? 'Why not send for the Duke or for Peel? The thing does 'not bear looking at.' It was at best a reckless, convulsive movement, and it failed as it deserved.

The King absolutely refused to make peers. He—

'Assures Lord Grey (May 9, 1832) and his colleagues, that his sense of the value of their services, and of the real ability and integrity with which they have discharged their duties at a period and under circumstances of extreme difficulty, is unimpaired and undiminished; but his Majesty cannot reconcile it to what he considers to be his duty, and to be the principles which should govern him in the exercise of the prerogative which the constitution of this country has entrusted to him, to consent to so large an addition to the

peerage as that which has been mentioned to him by Lord Grey and the Chancellor to be necessary towards insuring the success of the Reform Bill in the House of Lords.'

On the same day Lord Grey and his colleagues resigned.

It is strange to note the blindness of exultation with which the winners looked on their temporary success. The Waverers were at once charmed by the defeat of the Whigs, and disgusted at its having been effected through the firmness of the Conservative ultras; inclined at once

> 'To greatly venerate our recent glories,
> And wish they were not owing to the Tories.'

'The position of the respective parties (says one of them) is curious. The Waverers undertook a task of great difficulty with slender means, and they accomplished it with complete success. All turned out as they expected and desired. But after having been in confidential communication with both parties, they have contrived mortally to offend both, and to expose themselves to odium from every quarter, and to an unusual imputation of insincerity and double-dealing; and this without any other fault than mismanagement, and the false position in which they found themselves, without influence or power, between two mighty parties. The Tories, who have exhibited nothing but obstinacy and unreasonableness, and who thwarted the Waverers by every means they could devise, have reaped all the benefit of their efforts, and that without admitting that they were right, and thanking them for bringing matters to this pass. They are triumphant in spite of all they did to prevent their own triumph, and have had all the spiteful pleasure of abuse and obloquy, all the glory of consistency and the satisfaction of pertinacity, with all the advantages which an opposite line of conduct promised to give them.'

But well might it be said a few days later: 'Their triumph 'was of short duration, and nothing so complete as their final 'discomfiture.'

On the resignation of the Whig Cabinet, the King sent for the Duke of Wellington, who undertook the task imposed upon him in a spirit of self-sacrifice. If he had refused to aid his Sovereign, he said, he 'should have been ashamed to show 'his face in the streets.' With what kind of reliance on his Sovereign's firmness he undertook it may be inferred from his letter, quoted a few pages above. He engaged to carry a Reform Bill of his own; he, who had always taken his stand on the ground that the Constitution needed none. He bound himself to encounter at once the wrath of an adverse community, and the reluctance of his own staunchest followers.

And, under the circumstances, we hold this the boldest attempt of him who had won twenty pitched battles. His negotiations, however, failed. The Tories of that day seem to have been made of somewhat different metal from those of the next generation. Except Lord Lyndhurst, he could not find a follower of note who would pledge himself to support him in his intended measure of Reform. The country was all but in arms. Revolution seemed to all men imminent. 'I went 'home,' says our Whig diarist on the day of the resignation, 'turning in my mind what place of refuge I should seek with 'my family on the Continent.' The Birmingham Union, 200,000 strong, announced their intention of encamping on Penenden Heath. 'Not only was the question of insurrec-'tion gravely mooted,' says Mr. Roebuck, 'but steps were 'actually about to be taken to organise an armed resistance.' The Duke gave way. The feelings of such men as the Duke and Lord Lyndhurst, rooted in their scorn of popular pressure, and also of the Whig leaders, can best be described by borrowing once more the language of Clarendon. 'His pride (that 'of Strafford) was by the hand of Heaven strangely punished, 'by bringing his destruction upon him by two things that he 'most despised, the people and Sir Harry Vane.'

And thus the question was finally decided. Lord Grey was recalled, inevitable and irresistible. The restored Ministry, however, were not so confident in their position as to allow them to dispense with the Royal permission to create Peers, if they should find it necessary. And now ensued a little episode in the history of Reform which has been very dramatically related, but from which it is the duty of relentless history to remove some attractive colouring. The story is thus told by Mr. Roebuck, who very candidly warns his readers against accepting it as anything more than the substance of information obtained by himself from a high quarter, but to the accuracy of which he will not pledge himself:—

'When the Duke of Wellington failed in his attempt to construct a Cabinet, the King found himself in an awkward predicament; neither was Lord Grey himself well pleased with his own position. The people had shown that the Reform Bill they were determined to obtain. There could be no mistake about the matter—the Bill must pass peaceably if possible; if not, it was clear that force would certainly be employed. The alternative was plainly the Bill or civil war. The King, terrified by this fearful condition of affairs, gave in writing his formal consent to create as many peers as Lord Grey *and the Chancellor* should deem requisite for the purpose of carrying the Bill.'

The words of this remarkable document (he subjoins in a note) were as follows:—

'The King grants permission to Earl Grey, *and to his Chancellor Lord Brougham*, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to ensure the passing of the Reform Bill—first calling up peers' eldest sons. Signed WILLIAM R., *Windsor*, May 17, 1832.'

'On the 17th (Mr. Roebuck proceeds) Lord Grey stated in the House of Peers that he had been recalled, but also said that he was as yet unable to say whether he remained a Minister, because he was not yet assured of being able to carry the Bill. On the 18th, however, his doubts were dispelled. He now entertained, he declared, a confident expectation of being able to carry it unimpaired and immediately. He refused to give his reasons for now entertaining this belief, but it would appear that he *was by no means sure of carrying the Bill, even though he had the King's promise to make peers*, and would not even say that he was a Minister until he was certain of the secession of the Opposition; that secession was brought about in an extraordinary manner, and the Ministers became acquainted with the determination of the Peers on the 18th of May.'

After this general statement Mr. Roebuck returns to the subject, to give a more particular description of the scene which had taken place between the King, 'annoyed and angry, 'as well as alarmed,' and his two Ministers. They refused to take office again

'unless a promise was given by the King that he would create as many peers as might be necessary to secure a majority in the House of Lords. The King was now helpless and obliged to yield; he did so with unmistakeable reluctance, however. So soon as the promise was given, the Chancellor, by way of precaution, begged to have it in writing; which request was also acceded to, and the paper, containing the written promise of the King, was given to the Chancellor. . . . The Chancellor's asking for a written promise (adds Mr. Roebuck in a note) Lord Grey deemed harsh and uncalled for. "I wonder," he said, "you could have the heart to press it, when you saw the state he was in." The Chancellor replied, "You will soon see reason to think I was right." . . . The paper on which this promise was given is *missing from the papers of Lord Brougham*, to whom it was originally entrusted, but at the time was seen by many persons, one of whom (Lord Sefton) remarked, "I never saw so large a matter on so small a bit of paper."' *

It is scarcely necessary to point out certain improbabilities on the face of this story, which it would require a considerable amount of authentication to remove. It is passing strange that the King should have conveyed such authority 'to Lord

* History, vol. ii. pp. 331–3.

'Grey and his Chancellor,' regardless of the affront thereby implied to his Prime Minister, by coupling him with a selected Member of his Cabinet, regardless of the affront to all the others who were excluded. Of all persons in the State, the Premier is the one who can least brook the having an 'alter ego' at his side. Of all premiers, Lord Grey was perhaps the one least calculated to submit to such an intrusion. And, it must be added, few monarchs would have been more scrupulously considerate than William IV. in treating every one with due regard to his position. Throughout these volumes, Lord Grey is always addressed *alone*.

But, in the next place, the anecdote is obviously confused and inconsistent. In one page, the written engagement of the King to allow the creation of peers is given textually, with signature and date. In the next page, we are told that this all-important document 'was given to the Chancellor, and is 'missing from his papers.' The end of the narrative seems to forget the beginning.

But from the papers now before us we derive one or two additional facts, of a somewhat untoward character. In the first place, it is pretty clear that on the 17th of May King William *was not at Windsor at all.* He and Sir H. Taylor address to Lord Grey *three* notes on that day, all dated from St. James's Palace. In the next place, on the *following* day, the 18th, a 'minute of cabinet' is passed (ii. 432), in which the Ministers ask 'for His Majesty's assurance of his consent to a 'creation in the event of any fresh obstacle arising; and feel 'themselves compelled to require it as a condition of their 'continuance in office.' Now if they had already in their possession the written promise stated by Mr. Roebuck to have been given on the 17th, it is obvious that this request of the 18th would have been wholly unnecessary. On the same day the King writes granting the assurance, only stipulating that any creation of commoners shall be avoided as far as possible, and that, 'to quote the Lord Chancellor's own words in the in-'terview between His Majesty, his Lordship, and Earl Grey, 'the lists of eldest sons and collaterals who shall be brought for-'ward, shall be completely exhausted before any list be resorted 'to which can entail a permanent addition to the Peerage.'

The King's assent to the creation once obtained, the fight was finally lost and won. The actual creation was avoided by the concerted secession of a number of peers, waiving farther opposition. A last stand was made, indeed, with the King's best wishes, to procure a raising of the 10*l.* qualification even on the third reading; but Lord Grey felt this impossible.

'You must not be surprised (he writes to Sir H. Taylor) if you find even those who are now opposing the Bill declaiming against it as too aristocratic. Indeed, Lord Ellenborough, in contending for the scot and lot right of voting, has been on the verge of doing so already. . . . With respect to the division in the upper classes of society (he adds, summing up rather mournfully the results of his victory), and its pernicious effects, nobody can feel these effects, or lament the feeling which has produced them, more sincerely than I do. The Bill once passed, I rather hope than expect that the waters of bitterness may cease to flow. I can only repeat, that there will be every disposition on my part to bury all that has passed in oblivion, which, as I have been engaged all my life in political contention, there is no one to whom this kind of strife is more painful; and I should be too happy if, by withdrawing myself from the scene, I could see those angry passions allayed, and obtain for myself the repose which my age requires.' (June 4, 1832.)

The Royal assent was given on the 7th; and the correspondence ends with a singular little appendix—an attempt on the part of the King, strongly backed by his brother the Duke of Cumberland, to induce Lord Grey to take Parliamentary steps against the Political Unions, which was firmly though respectfully declined by the Minister.

Long, and serious were the tokens left by that bitter contest on the political body corporate of the kingdom. Years were passed in acrimonious disputes, between angry champions raking up the ashes of the past; but in the midst of, and through, those disputes, vast and most beneficial changes were effected by the Reformed Parliament in some of the most important branches of our administration. And then followed what, to an ardent politician—to one of those who seem to value the storm rather for the excitement which it occasions, than for the clearing of the atmosphere which it is ultimately to produce—must have appeared a decennium or two of sluggish collapse. The old factions seemed effete, the old war-cries sounded faintly in the ear. The Court and the Sovereign had become thoroughly popular among us: not with the mere temporary popularity of periods of agitation, but through a solid approval, penetrating every rank, of the motives which governed them and of the example which they gave. But the root of the change lay doubtless much deeper even than this. It was to be found in the vast development of the wealth and enterprise of the nation: owing mainly to two contemporaneous causes—the establishment of free trade, and the creation of our railway system. The results were ascertainable, not merely in the increased wealth of the country generally, and consequent distaste for political agitation, but

partly also in the bribing off, as it were, of the agitators themselves. Those very men, the ambitious, active, pushing, plausible, the hunters after popularity for the sake of fortune, who, in 1832, had been at work all over these islands managing elections, conducting the political press, organising political unions, were in 1845 steady, eager men of business, planning new schemes of industrial enterprise, or laying by wealth accumulated from the fruits of old ones. To a clever adventurer, who was accustomed to risk a fortune in a day on the Stock Exchange or in Capel Court, the hopes and fears of political life afforded very insufficient and contemptible excitement. All things savoured of the new era of 'plutocracy'—our modes of life, our social arrangements, our press, our literature. England, handed over, according to the prophets of evil, to the exclusive government of the preponderating class, the ten-pound householders, became, in the hands of those dreaded arbiters of her destiny, the most aristocratic country in the world in sentiment; far more so, at all events, than she herself was before the Reform Bill, or at any other period of her modern history. How long that reaction might have continued undisturbed, had political leaders not called forth liberal agitation anew for their party purposes—how far the counter-movement now perceptible is real or fictitious, permanent or superficial—these are questions not to be dealt with in a cursory review of past times. But the history of those times is important to us in many respects, and especially in one—that it shows, conclusively, how great organic changes, as they are at the time esteemed, may pass over with results very dissimilar to those which the best reasoners at the time anticipated, and far less extensive: and renders it probable that the real guiding current of English society acts far beneath the surface, and is either slightly, or at all events slowly, affected by visible changes in the distribution of political power.

ART. IX.—1. *Report from the Select Committee on Mines; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* July 1866.

2. *Coal Mines* (*Accidents and Explosions*). Return of a Copy of a Circular Letter from the Home Office to, and Reports from, the Inspectors of Mines to the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the recent Accidents and Explosions in Coal Mines, &c. February, 1867.

THE title of the Parliamentary volume which heads this article is in part a misnomer, for it contains no report, but merely a large amount of desultory and miscellaneous evidence prefaced by an intimation that the committee propose to resume their labours in the present session. The primary purpose of this committee was to inquire into the operation of the Acts for the Regulation and Inspection of Mines, and into the complaints contained in petitions from some 14,000 coal-miners of Great Britain, which had been presented to the House of Commons. The desires of the petitioners, as expressed in the terms of a 'Petition of the Under-Miners of Northumberland and 'Durham' given in an Appendix, appear to be reasonable, but the justice of their complaints and the truth of their statements must, of course, be tested by evidence.

These grievances relate to several subjects connected with coal-mining—such as the modes of estimating work done and paying wages, but the most momentous complaints are those relating to 'the fearful sacrifice of life in mines and collieries,' which, say the miners, 'affords abundant proof that the legis-'lative measures hitherto passed have proved to be totally 'inadequate for securing the personal safety of the miners of 'this country.' To this matter alone shall we direct the attention of our readers, with a view of putting them in possession of such information as may qualify them to form an opinion upon a subject which has recently awakened universal public interest, in consequence of the late terrible explosions at Barnsley and in Staffordshire.*

* In the present article we are dealing exclusively with accidents terminating fatally. The impression which these will make might be very much deepened by an estimate of the additional number of serious but not fatal accidents. These are very numerous, but there is no return of them. Mr. Dickinson, inspector for the Manchester district, observes, 'There are about sixty fatal accidents every year

The public are by no means aware of the actual loss of life occasioned by coal-extraction in this country. By searching into various local publications in the North of England, and by a fair estimate of probabilities arising from what has been discovered, we are quite warranted in assuming the total number of lives sacrificed in our coal-mining, from the earliest notices to the year 1850, to be not less than 10,000. This is certainly not too high an estimate, and probably a very low one. In November of the year 1850 the first Act for the Inspection of Coal Mines came into operation, and henceforth we have some authentic data for accidents. During the ten years from 1850 to 1860, the deaths in or at all the British coal mines amounted to 9,090. In the ensuing five years, ending 1865, the deaths were altogether 4,827. Thus then adding to the 10,000 deaths up to 1850, 10,000 more (in round numbers) up to 1860, and nearly 5,000 more up to the close of 1865, we have in all an estimate of nearly 25,000 *deaths from coal-mine accidents*, from the commencement of any account of them to within little more than a year of the present date.

We apprehend that the melancholy mortality which we have just estimated has never before been brought, as a whole, before the country; and certainly it has never been sufficiently considered in its full and aggravated interest. Twenty-five thousand persons have been snatched from our industrial population in the midst of their occupations, and not only so much human life but likewise so much skilled labour has been removed from us. Not the infirm and useless, but the able and the industrious, have been thus hurried away. No other kind of work is attended with so many and so fatal accidents; and if there were suitable data for the comparison, it could probably be shown that our various wars of recent date have not deprived us of a greater number of human beings, while all the deaths in and around mines have taken and are taking place in periods of profound peace and high prosperity.

A complete list of deaths from colliery accidents for the ten years commencing January 1st, 1856, and ending December

---

'in my district, and besides these fatal accidents a large number of 'non-fatal accidents that require investigation.' Of course these are quite unknown to the public. During a visit of some months paid to one of our principal coal-fields, we had daily opportunities of seeing and conversing with the victims of such accidents. We conversed with many pit-lads who had been 'lamed' (or injured) several times in a few years, and who reckoned events by the chronology of their various 'lamings.'

31st, 1865, has been compiled by one of the present inspectors, Mr. Atkinson, of which the following table is a summary:—

Causes of Death	Number of Deaths	Proportion Per Cent.	Amounting to
Deaths resulting from fire-damp explosions	2,019	20·36	About one-fifth
Deaths resulting from falls of roof and coals	3,953	39·87	About two-fifths
Deaths resulting from shaft accidents	1,710	17·24	Less than one-fifth
Deaths resulting from miscellaneous causes and above ground . .	2,234	22·53	More than one-fifth
	9,916	100·00	

We now proceed to notice the four principal causes of these mining deaths, taking the above summary as our text.

First and foremost come the Explosions of Fire-damp, which, though not so frequent in occurrence as some others, are certainly the most sweepingly destructive and fearfully interesting of all colliery calamities, and, at the same time, the most difficult to be guarded against—and those most exacting an unremitting vigilance and experimental knowledge. We must presume that our readers are acquainted with some elementary principles in connexion with these catastrophes. Coal-pits are divisible into two large classes—gaseous and non-gaseous, or, as the miners say, 'fiery' and non-fiery pits. The former might again be subdivided into fiery and very fiery pits, in accordance with the less or greater amount of gaseous emanations. Fire-damp, or light carburetted hydrogen gas, exudes from the coal containing it so soon as that coal is worked, and continues to exude at intervals and in proportion to the amount of atmospheric pressure. There seems much reason to suppose that it exists naturally in a high state of tension in the coal-beds, and that when the pressure of the atmosphere decreases more gas escapes. The common air, in fact, to a certain extent, weighs upon and imprisons it. In some very gaseous coal its escape is audible in a low hissing sound, which we have sometimes listened to in the gloomy stillness of a dangerous mine. Unhappily the best burning coal often produces the most gas, as is the case in the old and only true Wallsend pit near Newcastle. That very fiery mine is now closed, and probably closed for ever. Well is it that it should be closed, for such a seething gasometer is there covered up, that a mere slender tube let down to it and brought from it to the open air, for a long time sent forth an unfailing

stream of gas which being lit would flame night and day continuously. There is gas enough in the broken wastes of that famous old mine to light up the whole town of Newcastle, and probably to blow the town into ruins if exploded underneath it.

To render this gas actually explosive,* it must be mixed with at least four times its volume of atmospheric air. When mixed with less than four times, or more than sixteen times its volume of air, it will not explode. Shut out the air from it altogether and it is harmless, give it a little air and it becomes dangerous, a little more and it is more dangerous, and with still more air it becomes highly explosive, until a large addition of air deprives it of all its devastating power. Hence a gaseous pit but slightly ventilated is thereby brought into the very condition of explosiveness, and the only effectual way of dealing with it is to dilute the gas with an abundant influx of pure air. Let it be mingled with common air to twenty or thirty times its own volume, and then it may be led like an enfeebled and fettered enemy along the mazy air-ways of the pit, and finally be dismissed to the clouds above.

To do this is the aim of Ventilation, a word which, while it suggests but a simple process to the casual reader, calls up before the view of a mining engineer a series of extended and carefully devised arrangements which, at least in the North of England, have attained to a complex and highly artificial system. The principle of the arrangement for ventilating a coal-pit is that of two distinct shafts, a downcast and an upcast. At the base of the latter a huge fire of coals is kindled, and the effective ventilation is measurable by the difference of the weight of the two columns of air in the two shafts. The lighter the column in the upcast, or the greater the rarefaction, the better is the ventilation. Yet there is a practical limit to its

---

* Here we use terms popularly, for 'fire-damp' is a name given to different combinations of gases, the only combustible element in which is the carburetted hydrogen. As may be supposed, the vulgar names for several mine-gases are not used with any distinct knowledge of their real properties or differences. Chemically speaking, fire-damp, or marsh or mine gas, is composed of one equivalent of carbon and two equivalents of hydrogen. Its specific gravity is nearly half that of common air, and by its levity it tends to rise to the upper parts of passages. On its combustion it forms carbonic acid and water. Carbonic acid is thus generated by a mine-explosion, and is so dense as to accumulate at the floors of passages. Being poisonous it becomes fatal to human existence, and suffocates those who inhale it. Further on we shall speak of this 'after-damp' more particularly.

amount, which has been much discussed amongst pit engineers and men of science. We cannot here explain what some men of science have called the Furnace-Paradox; but the substance of what they affirm is, that the effective power of the furnace is sooner reached than was once expected, and that beyond that limit no consumption of coal can produce increased results. Therefore, in lieu of the furnace, Mr. Gurney proposed to substitute the employment of a number of jets of steam, the emission of which at the upcast shaft would produce, as he alleged, a more powerful draught and a less irregular and uncertain current than that obtained by the furnace. This plan was fully considered at the time of its proposal, and shortly afterwards some of the eminent mining engineers of the North made experiments with steam-jets, and compared their effects with those of the furnace. Having perused the details of those experiments, we are compelled to conclude that, ineffective as the furnace is beyond a certain limit, the steam-jet cannot be recommended as an advantageous substitute for it.

The reader will at once perceive that the chief essential is a ventilating draught which will not reach its limit before it succeeds in sweeping out as with the strong wings of a steady wind the noxious emanations of the mine. In an extensive mine, where the passages are long, numerous, tortuous, and small, and where there are many human beings at work vitiating the air, it must be a very powerful impulse which will drive an adequate air-current, in good and pure condition, through several miles of subterranean excavations, and carry it over all obstacles to its final discharge into the upper air. Add to these obstacles the natural *drag* or retardation by friction, which gradually weakens the air-current, so as to make what is at first like a tight rope become at last a slack one, and the necessity for great power of impulse is still more apparent. An air-current in a large pit may exceed ten or twenty miles in its entire length, and, like a traveller bound on a benevolent mission, it must retain its energy undiminished to the last, and give out its refreshing succours at every intermediate station.

The furnace system has long prevailed in British coal mines, but it has been largely abandoned in those of Belgium; and a Belgium engineer who lately visited us declared that we were ten years behind his country in coal-mining engineering, particularly instancing our retention of the furnace. Several minor evils attend the use of it, one of which is that it speedily injures the mining gear in the shaft which it heats. In some instances the men descend and ascend by the heated shaft, and it may

readily be conceived how injurious it is to go down and come up a long subterranean chimney, which a furnace shaft really is, with a monster fire burning at its base. Some explosions have been attributed to the furnace, at which the 'return air,' loaded with gas, has been said to have ignited. The Belgians use and advocate mechanical fans, which act somewhat in the manner of huge paddle-wheels in steam-ships, and by rapid rotation over a shaft produce a draught which the incoming air rushes to meet, and thus they powerfully promote ventilation.

The old mining engineers of the North, provincially termed *Viewers*, were wedded to the furnace; but as they have died or retired, their successors are more open to comparison and to conviction. Some fans have been tried and approved in Welsh collieries, and a committee of the Northern mining engineers have been engaged in instituting an inquiry, and a comparison between furnaces and fans. This inquiry ought to have been instituted some years ago, and we ought now to know whether fans really should supplant furnaces.

The gross abuses which had previously existed in many of the coal-mining districts by making one shaft do the duty of two, thus affording an insufficient supply of air, and at the same time incurring serious and constant risk of derangement or explosion, have in part been remedied by an Act of Parliament (25 and 26 Victoria, cap. 79), which rendered it illegal, after 1st January 1865, to work any coal-pit wherein more than twenty persons were employed at one time with less than two shafts or outlets, by which distinct means of ingress and egress should be available to the persons in the pit. All our readers will remember how, for want of such distinct means of egress, the unhappy miners engaged in the Hartley pit in Northumberland were caught as in a trap by the breaking of a huge iron beam in the only shaft.

Two shafts, however, are but an elementary and a primary provision for safety, or for escape when an accident has occurred.* While systematic and admirably contrived ventilation

* A subject imperatively demanding attention, is the propriety of limiting by legislature the area of coal to be worked by two or more shafts, and of restricting the number of miners employed for each pair of pits. 'For many years,' says Mr. Inspector Brough, 'my 'own opinion has entirely rested on the principle of a greatly in-'creased number of shafts in fiery mines.' Mr. Inspector Wynne, in a recent letter to the Secretary of State, expresses a decided opinion 'that not more than 200 acres of coal should be worked from one 'pair of shafts, and that an additional shaft should be provided for

is obtained in most of the well-conducted pits on the Tyne and the Wear, and in some other districts where capital and enterprise are abundant, the reverse is still the case in several of the coal-fields more remote from great cities and centres of skill and activity. In passing from the consideration of ventilation it may be remarked, that this is the principal provision on which all practical miners rely for the safety and salubrity of coal-pits. All others are subordinate or subsidiary to it. By the curious and effective method of 'splitting' main currents of air, and by the creation of various kinds of stoppings, doors, arches and 'brattices,' a current of air may be as easily subdivided into lesser currents as water into separate rills; and if the position of all the pitmen be known and 'splits' of air taken in to them all, while the whole of the subdivided currents are finally made to reunite in passing out of the pit, little more is necessary than the keeping up of such ventilation to the highest amount of efficiency.

The question, however, necessarily arises, whether existing arrangements can and do maintain the maximum of desired efficiency. In all mines of whatever extent, if not of an extremely fiery character, this maximum can be obtained. As a general rule, it may be admitted that thorough and systematic ventilation will accomplish all that can be at present expected. The only serious difficulty in most cases would be the enforcing of the requisite supervision, and the application of such regulations as might mainly help to enforce it. But it still remains an unsettled problem, whether those pits which are extremely fiery can, by any amount of ventilation now producible or produced in British mines, be rendered absolutely safe. If we believe, with one of the mining engineers of the North of England (Mr. T. J. Taylor, now deceased), who investigated this subject more carefully than his predecessors, that fire-damp lies imprisoned in the coal under a pressure of several atmospheres, and that it sometimes rushes out with prodigious force and volume, so as to produce what pitmen term *blowers;* and if we further believe that these blowers will foul a considerable area in ten or fifteen minutes, and so foul it that the whole space becomes to the highest degree explosive, then all such ventilation as we have now at command must on such occasions fail for a time, though it need not fail for a longer time than the dissipation of the blower

'every additional 100 acres.' It is lamentable to see the reckless and dangerous rapidity of extracting coal in many mines without adequate provisions for safety and health.

demands. We agree with the late Mr. Taylor on this subject; nevertheless, we think that great blowers are uncommon; and that by thorough ventilation even as at present practised, it is capable of being reduced and dissipated without insuperable difficulty.* Viewers do indeed sometimes assert that no power or skill of man can wholly prevent explosions, and looking at the progressive deepening and widening of dangerous mines and the lack of correspondingly progressive precautions and vigilance, explosions may unhappily be expected; but we have no doubt that they could be materially diminished in number, as they have already been to some extent, and that the minimum attributable to a natural necessity might be attained at no distant date.

If air be as essential to miners below as it is to us all above ground, equally so is Light. Where there is no fire-damp, the only question is, what will afford the brightest and cheapest illumination, and candles or oil-lamps may be employed at pleasure. Where fire-damp exists men can only work by the light of some kind of safety-lamp. The Davy-lamp is universally known by name, though comparatively few have seen one, or understand its principle, much less its varieties, or the improvements made upon it in safety-lamps bearing other inventors' names. The original Davy-lamp is simply an oil lamp surrounded by a fine wire-gauze, so fine as to contain from six to eight hundred openings in a square inch. Gauze thus minutely meshed will not allow the flame from the oil wick to pass through it, and it therefore prevents the explosion of external mixtures of air and fire-damp. But it will permit such external mixtures to pass into the flame, and then there will appear a *cap* or *top* on the interior flame greater and greater in proportion to the explosiveness of the exterior mixture. Thus we may have a half-

* When, however, we have to consider the 'goaves,' or waste and abandoned parts of old fiery mines, there can be no doubt that they are vast natural gasometers, from the edges of which fire-damp flows out largely and frequently. Whether a viewer should ventilate goaves, or insulate them and shut them up, is a technical question; but those old goaves, increasing and enlarging as they do by the mode of working pits, are most dangerous neighbours, and are to coal-miners what powder-mills and magazines are to country towns. Messrs. Lyell and Faraday paid a brief visit to the North of England several years ago, and published their views on the method of depleting goaves and rendering them less dangerous. We never heard, however, that their suggestions were in any one instance adopted, nor have the viewers of the North been at all influenced by their advice.

inch or one-inch top on the interior flame, and learn thereby the certainty as well as the degree of danger. Pitmen are too familiar with such tops to be greatly alarmed at them; but the casual visitor to a pit, however much he may confide in the Davy-lamp, does not feel at all easy under such appearances, and is soon disposed to return towards daylight and pure air.

The Davy-lamp is the best friend of pitmen, but they often treat it as disrespectfully and injuriously as they would their worst enemy. They attempt to enlarge the flame and to get more light from the lamp than it is formed to give. Some will even make a match-box of it, and open it to light their pipes. To preserve it from such indignities most employers put a lock upon it, and all lamps are or should be locked before delivery to the miners. Yet not a few of these men are so reckless and perverse as to procure false keys or to pick the lock of their lamp. Disastrous explosions have thus been caused, including, to all appearance, one of the recent great explosions in Yorkshire. In such instances the foolhardy miner usually meets the death he has brought upon his innocent but destroyed companions. Let the men be as strongly reprobated for such murderous misdeeds as their masters for other carelessness. A picklock lamp-bearing pitman in a gaseous mine is a criminal of unmitigated baseness, and ought to be punished proportionably to the calamity contingent upon his misconduct.

For more than forty years has the Davy-lamp been in use, and therefore upon public and careful trial. Generally, the Northern mining engineers regard it as really safe, and we have never found experienced miners declare it to be otherwise, under ordinary conditions, and with the use of the essential precautions.* Nevertheless, some modified lamps are rather preferable in practice. Thus George Stephenson's lamp, which the pitmen fondly call 'the Geordie,' is protected by a glass, and so long as this exterior glass remains whole, gas will not increase the intensity of the flame beyond a certain degree, when it will be extinguished. Should the glass break, this lamp simply becomes a Davy-lamp. The glass may be broken accidentally,

* The long and animated controversy about the safety of the simple Davy-lamp has not materially affected the opinion above expressed. Nevertheless, certain particular instances of explosion do seem to tend in some degree to invalidate the prevalent confidence; but not unless there are strong currents or extraordinary conditions. On the whole, then, this lamp may still be pronounced safe under ordinary conditions; and Sir Humphrey Davy himself does not appear to have expected more.

but in a mine where 200 such lamps were in use, it has been found that scarcely ever has a piece been broken out of a glass.

Another form of lamp is that invented by Dr. Clanny (whose claims were rather slighted); and when a metal chimney is given to Clanny's lamp, with some trifling additions, it becomes the lamp of Mueseler, which is much in favour and use in Belgium, where 400 are employed in one mine. Still further modifications in safety-lamps have been introduced both at home and abroad. The grand desideratum is to obtain more light consistently with security. The objection of the pitmen to the Davy is lack of light, but light must always be combined with security and portability. In respect to safety, undoubtedly those lamps which go out at once in an explosive mixture are the best; but safety at the cost of being left in total darkness in the inextricable labyrinth of passages in an extensive mine, is extremely inconvenient.

It is manifestly bootless to put confidence in safety-lamps while *gunpowder* continues to be used for blasting the coal in fiery pits. It is inconceivable that so perilous a custom anywhere prevails. Yet even so lately as 1862 sixty lives were sacrificed by it at St. Edmund's Main Colliery near Barnsley in Yorkshire, and other serious accidents have probably been due to the same cause. Such an infatuated proceeding is actually conveying flame to the gas, and doing on the one hand what, on the other hand, safety-lamps are designed to prevent. The 'firing of a shot' in the inner working faces of a pit known to harbour much fire-damp is no ordinary trial of courage. The sound of the dull boom that follows each blasting conveys to all who are not habituated to it, the idea of a more extended and fatal explosion—that of fire-damp. It may be thought that none but madmen would thus blast coal while any quantity of gas is or has lately been present; equally, however, may it be thought that no sane man would, in like circumstances, open his Davy-lamp; yet men do both the one and the other. As it is affirmed that fire-damp sometimes issues very suddenly in large quantities, and fouls a whole district of a pit in perhaps ten or twenty minutes, getting coal by gunpowder should be absolutely prohibited whenever gas comes forth so abundantly as to require the use of safety-lamps.*

---

* In their joint report, dated 26th of Jan. 1867, the united inspectors recommend that this new General Rule be added: 'In all 'workings in coal, where safety-lamps are used as the means of light-'ing, no blasting powder shall be used in such mine.' We should also be inclined, with one of the inspectors, Mr. Brough, to introduce

One of the foremost among the many advantages of the Davy-lamp is its value as a sure and simple indicator of the presence of fire-damp, and therefore of danger. Every morning, before work begins, a subordinate officer, named an *overman*, or *deputy*, perambulates the working places of the pit, and with his Davy in his hand, carries the test of safety and the measurer as well as the indicator of danger. If his lamp show a tall cap or a halo and an enlarging flame, he at once knows that the hewers of coal who are to follow him must be warned of peril, and in case of much explosive air a rude signal is so placed as to warn off the hewers altogether from the place. Men who disregard this warning do so in defiance of death. The overman himself incurs the first risk, and measures it, and hence he ought to be much better acquainted with the principles of the Davy and the chemistry of gases than he commonly is. Upon his preliminary survey, and that of his colleagues, depends the safety of the whole company of workmen underground. Many of these deputies are uneducated and ignorant to a lamentable degree.

Yet even as an indicator the Davy lamp has its limits of usefulness, for it can only indicate to the one bearer of it, if he be an overman alone on his early travels through the pit, and it can only indicate at one time, as well as to one man. To become a continual indicator, it must be suspended *in situ*, and frequently consulted. To compensate for these defects, which necessarily attach to all portable lamps, Mr. George F. Ansell, of Her Majesty's Mint, has invented an ingenious and simple instrument, by which he professes to show both the accumulation and the rate of accumulation of a mass of fire-damp, or even of carbonic acid, so as to make this known to the master, without man's agency, and thus to cause the servants to be more particular in observing rules and performing their duty. For this purpose Mr. Ansell employs a balloon of thin india-rubber, which, singularly enough, is expanded both by carbonic acid and by fire-damp. This balloon is filled with atmospheric air, tied at the neck, and bound round to prevent lateral expansion. So prepared it is placed under a small lever upon a wooden stand, so as to exert a gentle pressure on the lever. If fire-damp or carbonic acid accumulate round it, either the

---

a rule against the mixed use of safety-lamps and naked lights in gaseous mines. The use of candles either by exploratory or other miners in pits at all fiery, leads to numerous fatal accidents, all of which might be prevented by the exclusion of naked lights. A General Rule to this effect appears to be advisable.

one or the other will pass (by a particular law of gases well known to chemists) through the substance of the indiarubber balloon, and accumulating inside, cause it to expand, so as to press against the lever, thereby raising it and releasing a detent, with which the terminal poles of a battery are connected. By this arrangement a telegraphic communication is effected to a distant locality, and a warning on the spot may be given simultaneously.

The greatest peril in a fiery mine and that which is the most difficult to be guarded against, is a sudden and violent discharge of fire-damp. Such discharges, as we have previously intimated, are known as 'blowers;' they issue with prodigious force and emit an immense quantity of fire-damp in a very short time, so that long passages of a pit have in not many minutes become filled with highly explosive air, or, as pitmen say, 'fouled.' In such cases Mr. Ansell would apply a little apparatus in the belief that no irruption of gas can be so sudden that his invention will not announce its approach in from five to ten seconds, according to the percentage of fire-damp contained in the eruption. This instrument consists of an iron funnel, whose stem is bent like the letter U, the funnel part being closed with a plate of glazed Wedgwood ware; the stem being closed with a cap of brass, through which is passed a platinum-tipped copper wire, capable of just dipping into mercury previously placed in the bend of the funnel. The distance between the platinum-pointed wire and the mercury regulates the point at which the indication as regards the eruption should be given. If when the instrument is properly adjusted, gas impinges on the porous tile, diffusion (according to the known chemical law of diffusion of gases) takes place, and the presence of the accumulating gas forces the mercury against the platinum-pointed wire, and the circuit being thus completed telegraphic warning is given on the spot, and may be conveyed to the distant manager's room, either by a needle or by a bell.*

Such instruments are admirable in theory, and ingenious in their useful application of the remarkable law of the diffusion of gases made known by Mr. Graham, but it remains to be seen how far the promises of their inventor are verified by practice. At least full and repeated trials should be given to them before they are consigned to neglect. Some similar or modified instrument may be ultimately found successful, and

* Appendix No. 4. to the Evidence of the Select Committee on Mines.

it would be no slight advantage in the management of a fiery pit, if the manager could be infallibly apprised of accumulating gas even though its amount were unknown. A further and signal benefit would be conferred by enabling the manager also to ascertain with facility the amount of gas per cent., and this Mr. Ansell would accomplish by employing the present aneroid barometer, very delicately constructed, and bearing a porous tile in the place of its ordinary back. Having adapted it for his purpose by some mechanical additions, he takes it into the suspected part of a pit, and holds it by the ring handle till it has become of the same temperature as the place where it then is. The maximum effect of a gaseous atmosphere on this instrument is produced in about forty-five seconds, when the face of the indicator must be immediately and accurately read, because when the maximum is attained, what the chemist terms *effusion* takes place, namely, the mechanical passage of gas through the tile by pressure above, and then the hand on the face travels back to zero. When *diffusion* ceases, effusion takes effect and empties the chamber of gas.

Our apprehension is, that in the present lack of scientific knowledge, accuracy, and tact amongst at least the second and inferior orders of colliery managers and men, Mr. Ansell's instruments are far too delicate in their construction and application to become much used in pits; but he deserves great credit for his philanthropic attempts, and practical chemists will admire his ingenuity if practical colliers decline to avail themselves of it. It is notable that the Davy-lamp simultaneously afforded corresponding indications while Mr. Ansell was testing his aneroid instrument, and it is satisfactory to find, as Mr. Ansell observes, 'that marvellous arrangement, 'the Davy-lamp, gives magnificent indications.' In truth, if the simple Davy-lamp were fairly treated and fully accepted, and if those who use it were thoroughly acquainted with its principles and with all its indications, fiery pits might be worked with comparatively little risk of explosions.

An electric light has naturally suggested itself to men of science as a source of illumination for coal-pits, and two or three years ago a foreign *savant* appeared at Newcastle with a mining lamp on this principle. This invention gave a safe light, but too feeble and uncertain for practical use; it had been suggested to the inventor by the glowworm. On the general question there can be no doubt that a powerful, brilliant, and perfectly harmless light might be introduced into pits by the use of a good battery and all its necessary adjuncts. But no man who has travelled through the long,

weary, tortuous, and seemingly interminable ways and bye-ways of an old and extensive coal-pit would propose batteries and wires and other apparatus as a *simple* substitute for portable safety-lamps. The first question would relate to practicability, which may be doubtful from the extent of area, the difficulty of adjustment, and liability to derangement. The next question would be cost, and on that we have no doubt that the expense would deter nearly all managers and owners of coal property from voluntarily employing the apparatus. The third question would be, Who will consent to bear the expense and pains of a first and full trial? It would, however, be very desirable to make experiments on a small scale, and thus to ascertain if these warrant a larger outlay and more extended trials. Pitmen have a great objection to any but the simplest and most indispensable apparatus underground, and numerous or lengthy wires would be much exposed to casual or malicious injury.

A public exhibition of mining-implements and improvements in Newcastle or Durham or Leeds, Manchester, or Birmingham, would be of great utility to the coal-mining population. At such an exhibition managers and miners might observe models or specimens of every kind of safety-lamp, and of all implements and instruments which have been suggested either by scientific or practical men. If such exhibitions were periodical, and if foreign coal countries were invited to combine, signal advantages would ultimately accrue. It is strange that so vast and important a section of our industrial population as our coal-miners—the males, according to the census of 1861, employed in coal-mines, amounting in number to 282,473; and according to the computation of the inspectors in 1865, to 315,451—should be without some such exhibition, while agricultural shows, displaying various agricultural implements, are frequent and successful. The numerous benefits arising from the adoption of this suggestion will occur to miners, and one at least would be the establishment of intercommunion between the men of different and distant coal-fields. Thus some of the 33,000 colliery workers of South Durham might fraternise for the best purposes with some of the thousands of their fellow-workpeople in other localities. Scientific men, too, might attend these meetings, and there might as well be a British Association for the Advancement of Mining, as a British Association for the Advancement of Science. All projects like those of Mr. Ansell might be there expounded and discussed; and instead of mere local Institutes of engineers there would be a general gathering of mining science and skill

from our entire coal-fields. There was, indeed, a few years ago, a meeting of Mechanical Engineers at Birmingham, which was both successful and agreeable. Why should there not be an extension and recurrence of such meetings, on the plan of our suggestions?

While so much has been said of fire-damp, it is apt to be forgotten, and perhaps is little known, that mining viewers of large experience attribute at least seventy per cent. of the deaths in fiery mines to *after-damp*, and the small remainder only to fire-damp. The after-damp, sometimes called choke-damp, is a combination of gases in proportions dependent upon the peculiar circumstances of each explosion. These combined gases are nitrogen, carbonic acid, carburetted hydrogen, and common atmospheric air. Carbonic acid gas is dense and poisonous, and in an atmosphere containing as little as ten per cent. of it, human life can only be maintained for a short time. Indeed three per cent. is fatal if the amount of oxygen falls below eighteen per cent. in the same atmosphere.

In several instances of exploded pits, little companies of men in the interior who had escaped and survived the explosion, have been cut off and destroyed by the immediate generation of after-damp. The effect of death by the one gas or the other is very distinctly seen in the countenances of the dead. The poor men killed by the fire-damp are marked with burns and scorchings, and their features all more or less distorted or disfigured. On the other hand, where men have been suffocated by choke-damp, their features are placid and simply inanimate. It is evident that the after-damp has speedily deprived them of the power of breathing, and has almost instantly choked them.

Utter neglect of precautions against after-damp seems to be prevalent in all mining districts. Not a few propositions have been made from time to time in this direction, but we never read of any practical application of them in the hour of danger and death. If common air could have been conveyed at once to the two hundred and four sufferers in the Hartley pit when they were under the deadly influence of after-damp, most of them might still be alive.

It should be the aim of managers by additional contrivances to render every miner as independent of the noxious influence of after-damp, as a good safety-lamp can make him independent of fire-damp. The miners themselves should always carry simple means of covering the face. An inspector of mines once told us that in investigating the circumstances of many explosions, he heard of several instances where pitmen caught

by an explosion but surviving it, had placed a wetted cap or handkerchief over their faces, and then passing over the dead bodies of their unfortunate companions, had come out safely from the extreme recesses of the pit. So, too, have pitmen saved themselves by stuffing their caps into their mouths, and then bending as low as possible have crept securely to the shaft.

Those to whom this subject is unfamiliar will have been astonished to perceive in the brief tabular abstract at the commencement of this article that the deaths from falls of the roof and pieces of coal in pits have amounted to 3,953 in ten years, and that these form two-fifths of the entire number of deaths from all extraordinary causes, and considerably more than those arising from any other specific cause, being at the rate of 39·87 per cent. The difference between the mortality from explosions and from such falls is similar to that between a brief epidemic and an habitual local disease, or, to vary the metaphor, between a short, sudden battle, and a continuous dropping fire upon a retreating enemy. A little explanation will make it apparent how these deaths so frequently, and, as it may be said, so regularly, occur.

Nature has packed up coal so closely and compactly that it is impossible to put more of it in the same space by any mechanical means. But when man begins to break up a coal-seam, he, as it were, unpacks the load, or destroys the coherence and balance of the whole mass. He removes the natural support of the coal-bed; he takes, as an architect would say, the floor out from the building, and as he only imperfectly props up the roof and walls, a more or less speedy ruin ensues. The main-ways or high-roads of a mine are built up and arched like our railway tunnels, and hence they are safe enough. But this cannot be done in the low, long, narrow passages which are often not above four feet in height, nor could proprietors bear the expense for many miles in area. Propping up with timber is the only available expedient, and when sufficient and sufficiently sound timber is employed little more is needed than watchfulness in repairs. Unhappily the temptation to spare expense often leads to inadequate timbering, and the rapid destruction of the props by wear and tear, and the rot generated by the damp heat underground, make this a serious item of expenditure.

The character of the coal itself in some places adds to the necessity of much timbering. In South Staffordshire the rhomboidal structure of the material in its jointy beds causes the 'famous ten yard seam' to be much intersected, and produces a naturally complicated network of joints, in the direction of

which the coal is very ready to fall asunder. This corresponds in some measure to what the Germans expressively call 'slickensides.' Moreover, by what is technically termed 'the 'pillar and stall' mode of excavating, enormous cavities are left behind, often of thirty feet in height, and of course 'settle-'ments' ensue, together with violent concussions and sudden collapses, locally called 'lumps,' of great masses of material. Even a small piece falling from a height of from twenty to thirty feet may kill a man, how much more fatal must large fragments be! In the year 1857, in the collieries only of South Staffordshire and Worcestershire, eighty-one persons were killed by falls from the roofs of pits, in obtaining 6,000,000 tons of coal. This amounts to 13·5 deaths per million ton of coals got. At the same time, the average of deaths from the same cause for the whole of Great Britain was 5·15. Thus, this is the special evil of one district, and the local inspector has stated that inexcusable carelessness prevails in timbering the roofs. If a place only looks safe, without any test, a few props alone are put up, and consequently a fall soon occurs. 'The reigning cause of the destruction of human life,' to quote Mr. Brough, an inspector's words, 'is the constantly 'recurring falls of stone and coal from overhead and from 'the sides of working places.'* Indeed, if we take England, Wales, and Scotland together, it may be affirmed that not a single day passes without the occurrence of some calamity from falls of ponderous masses of coal or shale or ironstone in coal and ironstone mining.

No legislative interference with the systems of excavation would be tolerated,† although it is affirmed that the 'long-wall' plan is superior to the 'pillar and stall' mode of working in particular cases at least, for by the former more coal is raised per acre, and better ventilation can be secured; but adequate

---

* The same inspector thus reports, under date February 1, 1867:— 'Something really must be done to prevent mortality by these falls 'of coal and stone. The number annually killed by such class of 'accident is dreadful in the extreme. Taking an average number 'of years since the inspection was established, it will be seen that 'death by falls of material goes frightfully beyond any loss of life 'by explosion of fire-damp. It is clear that something must be 'done: we should not go on crushing the people to death in this 'way.'

† In their Petition the miners complain that 'the practice in the 'Staffordshire collieries of working the thick coal in more than one 'face is highly dangerous and very destructive to life in the said 'collieries.'

timbering does come within the province of Government inspection, on the ground of safety of life and limb, and it is a miserable parsimony that permits one life to be destroyed every day in the year by culpable neglect.

There is a very dangerous duty in the economy of timber, called 'drawing the props.' In so doing men stand ready with an axe in the waste places of a pit, about to be abandoned, and knock out each prop successively, rescuing it and themselves at the same time. In one pit we ourselves stood at a little distance and witnessed this process. A man cleverly struck a prop, while another drew it away and both retreated. The roof then, having nothing to support it, began to give way and fall in. Woe to the unfortunate prop-drawer who cannot escape before the stones fall; yet men can be got to perform this hazardous duty for about the same pay as the hewers of the coal obtain.

The day, though not the date, may be clearly foreseen when machinery for cutting coal will supplant, so far as hewing is concerned, human labour. Coal-cutting machines have been for several years proposed and displayed in one or two forms, and have been successfully tried in a few instances. But the spur of necessity and the expectation of independence will urge on the masters to quicken and foster the germs of such inventions. At this very time the South Lancashire and Cheshire Association has offered prizes of money for the best machines of this character. All the efforts of the working miners to act upon and control their employers will tend to this end, and slow as the masters may be in entertaining other projects, they will gladly welcome such machines as will render them more and more independent of their men. Thus inferior and ungenerous motives often lead to substantial improvements.

Many arrangements have already been made underground, by which human suffering and painful labour are diminished. We remember a collier's song which had the burden, 'God 'bless the man who brought us metal trams,'—that is, the tramway-plates of metal which of late years have been laid down in pits, and have enabled the 'putters' to push along their loaded baskets of coal with greater facility. Much more animated and choral will the burden some day be, 'God bless 'the man who brought us down machines.' Meanwhile, however, adjustments consequent upon the introduction of new machinery will have to be made, and temporary deprivations to be endured. But hewing down coal in deep, hot, dark, dusty corners of pits is not a kind of labour which we can honestly wish to be perpetuated for civilised men. It is not,

perhaps, so unhealthy as some other occupations, chiefly because it is carried on only for a few hours per diem consecutively. But in thin low seams, where the hewers must needs lie on their sides, or squat down half naked in painful and unnatural postures to perform their work, the sooner cutting machinery can be introduced the better—better for the men as well as the masters, better for the mind as well as the body.

That the number of fatal accidents in shafts of coal-pits should amount to 1,710 in ten years — that is, to nearly one-fifth of the total number of accidents in the same period— may strike many readers with surprise. Had they, however, themselves descended shafts, especially in ill-conducted mines, that surprise would be considerably diminished. The passage below and upwards in many inferior mines is a passage of perpetual perils. The chain, or the conveying vehicle, or the rope, or some part of the winding apparatus, may be suddenly broken, and death as suddenly ensue by a terrible fall of the living load. From the careless way in which some men and many boys ascend and descend they are in daily risk of such a calamity. Even without carelessness in themselves, it may exist in the man who superintends their conveyance, or some part of the gear of the engine or pumps may fail. What happened in 1862 in the shaft at Hartley is too clearly in remembrance to need more than an allusion. A great variety of accidents may and do happen in shafts, and many that are injurious though not followed by death.

Nearly the whole of these calamities, and perhaps really all of them, arise from preventible causes. There can be no unalterable reason why any human being should fall down a shaft, or why a stone from the shaft-side, or the passing load of coals, should fall upon him. Ropes, chains, buckets, and all winding gear can be made strong and good, can be renewed when old, and examined when doubtful. The improvements, too, in shaft apparatus are considerable. Strong wire ropes are now and long have been in extensive use, while buckets and crazy baskets are superseded by the so-called 'safety cages,' which run smoothly upon iron guides, and somewhat resemble vertical railway trains. While descending in these safety cages one feels in perfect security. True, the suspending chain may break, but the cage is instantly caught by extending arms and stopped. All such machinery being in the first instance costly, it is chiefly adopted in superior districts, and is seldom found in rougher and more primitive coal-pits. In these latter, moreover, there is a lack of sufficient fencing and guarding, and consequently there are a number of what

are in effect pit-traps set for the destruction of any luckless and unwary passenger. The Act provides that none except males above fifteen years of age shall have charge of a windlass or other winding gear, and that in certain cases steam engines for winding shall only be in charge of persons above eighteen years of age. So far good, for mere lads were previously in charge of such apparatus; but it is to be hoped that fatal shaft accidents will now more speedily and very considerably diminish.

What are termed 'Miscellaneous accidents in mines and 'above ground,' which amounted to 2,234 in the ten given years, and formed more than one-fifth of the whole number of fatal casualties in that time, result from a great variety of causes. These we cannot specify in detail, but they are all, like those previously treated of, preventible by vigilance, care, and forethought; and even if this assertion were questioned or qualified, there is no doubt that a very important diminution might and should take place in their number. We do not mean to assert that with the present workmen and pitmen all recklessness or inattention can be speedily eliminated. But the more these men are educated and raised in self-respect and sensibility to evil, the more will the number and the occasions of injuries and fatalities be lessened.

From the information afforded in the preceding pages the reader will be qualified to consider and form an opinion upon the important subject of coal-mine inspection. It was a matter of great difficulty to obtain even a qualified assent from the coal owners and managers to any amount of inspection, and incoherent as these authorities were on other subjects, they became coherent enough for opposition to what they regarded as an invasion of private rights and liberties. A landowner who managed or possessed a coal mine treated it like a game preserve, and warned off intruders by penalties and threats of man-traps and spring-guns. The first Children's Employment Sub-Commissioner who visited the great northern coal-pits, found himself suspected, misconceived, and regarded in the light of a superior detective. More light gradually broke in upon the minds of the mining magnates, who became more urbane; but so soon as the first Act for Inspection was about to be framed, the coal-lords and the principal northern viewers combined to offer a strong opposition on details. Even enlightened Nicholas Wood took up arms in this warfare, and although it was never known to the public, every important clause in the Act was a matter of contest and mutual concession. The Act therefore finally

resembled a treaty between belligerents, and though what is now secured is less than one side hoped for, it is more than the other was at one time inclined to yield.

Now, however, that several years have elapsed, and inspection has been found to work well on the whole, we are in a much better position to judge of its efficacy and of its possible extension. In the tabular statement of colliery accidents for ten years before alluded to, which Mr. Atkinson, an Inspector of Mines, presented last year to the Select Committee on Mines, there is a comparison of the results of two quinquennial periods, and this comparison is designed to display the benefits of inspection. During the first period of five years embraced by the table, from 1856 to 1860, both inclusive, there were 5,089 deaths in the kingdom from colliery accidents; and during the same period 381,067,047 tons of coal were raised. On the other hand, during the next five years, from 1861 to 1865, both inclusive, 468,548,905 tons of coal were raised, so that if the deaths had increased in the same proportion as the quantity of coal raised, the deaths during the latter period of five years would have been 6,257·3 in number; whereas they only amounted to 4,827, being 1,430·3 fewer deaths during the second than during the first quinquennial period. This is a reduction to the extent of 22·9 per cent. in five years, being at the rate of 4·58 per cent. per annum in relation to the coal raised.

To display the benefit of one measure, viz., the passing of the Duplicate Shaft Act in 1862, it is shown that during a period of three years (1860, 1861, and 1862) immediately preceding the operation of this Act, there were 3,178 deaths from colliery accidents throughout the kingdom, while during the same period 264,358,164 tons of coal were raised; whereas during the three years (1863, 1864, and 1865) succeeding the passing of the Act, 286,853,443 tons of coal were raised; so that if the number of deaths had increased in the same ratio as the coal raised, the number of deaths during the latter triennial period would have been 3,448·4, while the actual number was 2,758 deaths, being 690·4 deaths less during the second than during the first of these two consecutive triennial periods.

Statistics and verbal testimony alike demonstrate the value of inspection. In some districts this value is more conspicuous than in others, and it may not be wholly attributable to the actual work of the inspectors, but as much to the greater care induced in the conductors of collieries, by the knowledge of the law as well as the beneficial operation of its provisions. For

example, there are general rules laid down by the Secretary of State, and in addition special rules for each district administered by the authority of the inspector. The special rules for the Lancashire coal-field, now lying before us, are well ordered and carefully detailed. By general and special rules, therefore, there is now a sort of codification of colliery law. The general rules for all coal and ironstone mines are fifteen in number, and are printed in the Act. The special rules are in each case to be framed by the owner of every coal and every ironstone mine, and transmitted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, after having been publicly suspended for fourteen days; and are finally returned to the framer for constant exhibition and enforcement. All the provisions relating to rules are excellent.

At present there are twelve inspectors of coal mines for England, Wales, and Scotland, and it has been the aim to distribute their allotted duties as fairly as could at first be estimated. In practice, however, great inequalities are found to arise, and must from year to year arise in consequence of the difference of districts and the disproportionate scales of mining extension. An inspector who has a number of fiery pits in his province experiences vastly more care and anxiety than one who has none of that class. He is always at the mercy of fire-damp, and always in fear of an explosion. Such an explosion as that which lately happened at Barnsley awakens grave solicitude and occasions much extra work for an inspector. In this particular instance the inspector resigned after the investigation into the explosion, and has been succeeded by another officer.

Each and all of the inspectors have far too many collieries to inspect if they really attempted to examine them. No doubt the public when they think for a moment on the subject, are under the impression that every considerable coal mine in the country is in course of periodical examination by some one of these twelve official gentlemen, and no doubt this is a natural conclusion. The inspectors themselves, however, hold a very different opinion of their duties, and carry out a very different practice. They do not profess to descend into and thoroughly inspect all of their pits.* They do not even propose

* This not only follows from the existing conditions of the collieries and the physical impossibility of such complete examination, but is likewise plainly avowed in the joint Report of the Inspectors to the Secretary of State, dated 26th January, 1867, where they observe—'The inspectors are of opinion that the present number of

to go down and through them all in any stipulated period. Many of the colliers have never seen them at all, and do not know them. To visit all the places underground is an utter impossibility as things now are, and an inspector may live and do his work during ten or fifteen years in his locality, and make his annual report to the satisfaction of the Home Secretary, without a personal and intimate knowledge of more than a very limited number of his collieries. All this they themselves admit, and this is what the working miners, as most people will think justly, complain of.

Can and ought the present twelve inspectors to do more? They themselves would reply—we cannot and we ought not. We cannot, as a matter of physical capability and personal comfort—we ought not, as we think, on grounds of expediency. We cannot, because we are not ubiquitous—and because it would be manifestly impracticable for us to satisfy ourselves of the condition of every mine out of some two or three or four hundred under our charge. Besides, they would add, it must be inexpedient for Government, through us, to assume the direction or admonition or control of all the mining managers subject to our visits. In such cases we should become the head engineers of our districts, and have to come into frequent collisions with the several managers and owners, with whom it is our policy to keep, as far as possible, on good terms. If we were to attempt to perambulate the whole of the deeper and larger mines, each of them would demand a day, or a large portion of a day,

---

'twelve inspectors is sufficient for carrying out the Act as it now 'exists. It is not contemplated that they should act as the viewers 'or managers of the collieries, but that they should be in the dis- 'tricts that matters may be referred to them, and that upon acci- 'dents occurring which may appear to them to be of a nature to 'require it, or upon removable danger being reported to them, or 'their having reason to expect danger, inspection may be made and 'the requisite steps taken to enforce the provisions of the law.' Two, however, of the twelve inspectors make separate reports and dissent on important points from their colleagues. One of these gentlemen, who is, we believe, the senior in age and the most experienced of all the inspectors, remarks, 'I believe we require more 'investigation underground than we have ever yet possessed, and 'there are two modes of arriving at this desideratum ; one is by 'the employment of sub-inspectors, and the other by again dividing 'the present twelve large districts of the kingdom.' The separate Report of this inspector, Mr. Lionel Brough, is more detailed and important than the joint Report of his ten colleagues ; the latter consisting only of two pages, and being quite inadequate to the occasion.

and we could not accomplish our other duties. One of these gentlemen, indeed, openly declares that if a condition of inspection be that the inspector may be called from his bed at dawn, to go down mines all day, the sooner the Act is repealed the better for all parties. A perpetual peripatetic supervision is to be dreaded alike by those who would have to perform it, and those who would have to endure it.

Here comes in the consideration of the objection founded upon a diminished or shifted responsibility. If, say the masters and managers of collieries, you propose to establish over us a rigorous and minute inspection, extending to the enforcement of the inspector's opinion or advice in details of management, then you will shift the responsibility of safe working from us to the inspectors. We cannot follow their advice and at the same time be responsible for the consequences of doing so—especially if their views should be contrary to our own. We, for instance, may think that a certain course of proceeding recommended by an inspector would lead to danger or an explosion. If we are compelled to adopt it, and an explosion should ensue, clearly we should be guiltless. We are satisfied to have the near residence and occasional visits of an inspector, and we do not object to show him whatever he legitimately desires to examine. We want no more, nor should we willingly endure more.*

Thus both managers and inspectors come nearly to the same conclusion. Things are tolerable as they are, are better than they were, and moreover, may be still better in years to come; why then interfere and introduce a new element of discord?

On the other hand, the miners themselves, as represented by the present petitioners and the most respectable and reflecting individuals of their body, express or would express, different views. The actual terms of the petitioners are these:—

'That the fearful sacrifice of life in mines and collieries affords abundant proof that the legislative measures hitherto passed have proved totally inadequate for securing the personal safety of the miners of this country.

'That your petitioners believe that the sacrifice of life in mines and collieries can only be prevented by the appointment of a sufficient body of sub-inspectors, whose duty should be to examine internally the mines and collieries in which your petitioners are called upon to labour.

'That the constitution and practice of coroners' courts, so far as

* Mr. W. Mathews, now president of the Mining Association, gave decided evidence to this effect before the sitting Select Committee (No. 12315).

they relate to accidents in mines, are so objectionable that justice is not secured to your petitioners.

'That accidents in mines are mainly caused by the want of skill in the agents, overmen, and chief managers of mines and collieries, and from lack of diligence or want of care on the part of the subordinate officers.'

Such are the words of the 'under-miners'—that is, we presume, the underground miners—of Northumberland and Durham, who as a body are considerably in advance of similar men in other coal-fields, and who, it should be remembered, work in the best regulated mines, on the whole, in the kingdom. The evils, therefore, which exist amongst them may be fairly presumed to exist in a more aggravated degree in other collieries.

Whatever abatement we may make in the representations of these miners for their supposed *esprit de corps*, and for their presumed antagonism to their employers—which, however, we are not inclined (from personal visits paid to these pits and pitmen in the two counties named,) to estimate as very important in this particular cause—whatever abatement may be made for any such feelings, there remains a very large residue of fact which the miners affirm they can justify by their experience. When examined as witnesses they naturally appear deficient in tact, and in the power of stating their case strongly. So that we must not judge by the scanty evidence we get from them in the volume before us. Knowing, however, full well their views and their mode of life and labour, we may state their case, perhaps, with more force and clearness than they do for themselves—and at the same time concisely.

They feel that the present supervision is quite inadequate for their safety, because they know from daily experience what is deficient; they work in the midst of such defects, and hear each other's complaints. The miners know what the inspectors do not and cannot know, except from themselves. It is true that they can give notice to the inspectors in their several districts of a notorious defect and any apprehended danger, and that in most instances they can rely upon the inspector's attention to their notification; but at the same time they feel that by giving such notice they incur the secret or open dislike of their superiors, and are sometimes plainly told, 'If the pit 'is not good enough for you, you can seek another.' Unfortunately they often have no personal knowledge of the inspector, and are seldom aware when he is about to visit their pits, although they allege that the masters always are, and often prepare the pit accordingly. They desire to have opportunities

of acquaintance and conversation with the inspector, and such ready access to him as shall enable them to tell him freely and instantly when there is danger and discomfort; and they desire to be allowed, without identification and risk of dismissal, to point out where and when his presence is required. They know so well, and see so clearly, that a well-designed system of inspection may be nullified by stratagem and avarice, that what really looks well to the public, and works well to some extent, appears to their strong insight 'totally inadequate to 'securing their personal safety.'

They do not so much wish for more inspectors of the same order as the present ones, although they would gladly welcome them if competent, as for sub-inspectors who would probably be more freely appointed and easily found than principal officers. Such persons, indeed, are ready to hand in and around the pits at this time. The working miners would suggest the appointment of such men as the under-viewers or second-rank managers of pits now are. This class of men (speaking from what we remember of the Northern collieries) obtain salaries of from 150*l.* to 250*l.* a year at present—rarely, perhaps, so much as 300*l.* They have in nearly all cases been brought up to the duty from early years, and in actual pitwork are frequently clever and trustworthy. Indeed, from this class often and ultimately come the viewers or head managers themselves. Select from their ranks twenty or thirty of the best men, subject them to careful examination, throw the appointments open to competition, and when you have obtained the required number, then distribute them over the entire kingdom and adjust their duties in subordination to the present and future twelve inspectors-in-chief. A systematic and personal inspection of pits would then be in operation; the sub-inspectors would report to their principals, and the labour of the latter would not only be lightened, but better directed, and not as now often dissipated and spent in vain; at the same time the working miners would feel more at home with the sub-inspectors, would get frequent hearings, and fuller sympathy with the details of their complaints.

The question is not whether the masters, owners, and chief engineers of collieries approve of this suggestion, for they certainly do not; nor is it a question whether there would not be frequent discords and disputes in consequence. Assuredly any regular and rigorous examination of pits would lead to these consequences upon the discovery and indication of neglect or defect. But the true question is, would the plan be efficient, and would the ideal of colliery inspection be thereby carried

into practice? Readers can judge for themselves, to some extent, from what we have laid before them; and we certainly do not see the full force of the objections of masters, managers, and inspectors to such a proposal. If they could be obtained, and paid, and stationed without delay or difficulty, we should prefer an addition to the present body of inspectors on an equal footing. Twenty in place of twelve might accomplish much, and in no long time bring up the inferior mines to the present level of the superior ones. Twenty capable and earnest men—twenty such men as *some* of the present inspectors are —ought fully to carry out the provisions of the existing Act —suggest and secure improvements, and, if fully empowered, work out all that could be fairly expected from supervision.

But if there be financial or other impediments to such an addition to the inspectors-in-chief (who, we may note in passing, are not too highly paid, if really efficient), then let there be sub-inspectors. The experiment has been tried in the inspection of factories, and has worked thoroughly well, to the satisfaction of all concerned. This fact is lost sight of when a number of fanciful objections are raised to the project, and when it is pronounced inoperative. Apart from possible improvements in inspection, and reverting to the present time, there is manifestly a want of some considering, experimenting, criticising, and admonishing head, or association of heads, in relation to the safe conduct of our extensive and valuable coal mines. There are now 3,256 collieries in Great Britain, and so rapidly have these increased in number, that in 1865 the number was only 2,614; should the future increase be in the same ratio, which perhaps is not likely, the argument we are now employing would be by so much strengthened. In all these collieries, in effect, every owner does as seemeth to him good. He is circumscribed only by conditions of policy, and to a slight degree by the few Government officers entitled inspectors. True, efficient superintendence, like honesty, is the best policy, for an owner of mines loses far more by a serious accident than he would pay for good overlooking. The same observation applies to fire insurance, yet many men do not insure; and, in like manner, many colliery owners do not provide the most careful, and consequently the more costly, supervision. There is wanting, therefore, for such men a force *ab extra*, and knowledge, judgment, and skill to justify that force.

The most delicate and successful indicator of fire-damp, the most improved and approved safety-lamp, effective ventilating fans, excellent and safe shaft machinery and winding-

gear, superior underground apparatus, coal-cutting machines of approved power and economy, and all the various coal-pit improvements and ameliorations which have been for so many years proposed and discussed — partly adopted and partly neglected,—all these may be well known to men of science, and their respective merits and defects clearly ascertained. Yet so far as most coal-owners and managers of pits in general are concerned, they might as well never have been invented or considered. There might be a Pantechnicon of coal-mine machinery and mining-gear in London, and every implement and improvement might be registered and ready for use, but still, without the impulse *ab extra*, things would go on underground as negligently as of old.

Strong hopes were once entertained that a special Mining College would be established somewhere in the North of England. For years the project was discussed, half-formed, and much favoured by the mining engineers of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and principally and earnestly by the most eminent of them, the late Nicholas Wood. Even he, however, with all his experience, influence, and skill, failed in this excellent enterprise; with his decease it is to be feared the Northern Mining College in prospect also perished.

The apathy of large bodies of mercantile men in relation to the highest interests of those working under them and with them is proverbial. Of late years, however, it has often been found possible to awaken even such bodies by strong and rightly-timed appeals to beneficent and ameliorative action. Though many coal-owners individually effect much good, yet collectively, we fear, they are as apathetic as any commercial body. Scattered over different districts, widely separated from each other, seldom coming into personal communication, and always deeply occupied in their callings and collieries, it is difficult to devise any method of appealing to and influencing them for good—for higher aims, for the attainment of the greatest efficiency and security in their collieries, and the steady advancement of their men in education, in mining ability, and in commendable conduct. For their own professional protection they can form a Mining Association which presents an united front; it is much to be desired that they would present equal unity and energy against ignorance, incompetence, and carelessness. Mining in the best coal-seams is yearly becoming more difficult, and yearly requires increased ability and fertility of practical resources in managers. Men of mining mark are frequently tempted away from the most systematically wrought pits to other districts by higher remuneration. Mr. Wood

declared twelve years ago, that there was in his vicinity in the Durham district, an actual scarcity of properly educated persons to take the management of mines. The class of competent managers has not been largely and proportionably increased since that time. The great body of pit-working people is not so much in danger of decreasing as the small body of fully educated superintendents. Were there good local mining colleges or high schools, this class would be gradually augmented. Such establishments are urgently required to raise the tone, form the character, and develop the talents of the young men who now live in and around the large coal-fields, with little stimulus to, and few means for, self-improvement. In such districts as South Staffordshire and Worcestershire even the overseers are notoriously ignorant, so much so that the local inspector, Mr. Baker, states in evidence—'We occasionally find the overseers 'of the pits quite as ignorant as the working-men. They are 'good men for all practical purposes in the mine, but as for 'education some of them are very ignorant indeed.'

We have purposely refrained from observations on the two notorious recent explosions in Yorkshire and Staffordshire, because the daily newspapers have published nearly all the evidence taken at the inquests, and because, also, they form the special subjects of reports to the Home Secretary, which will shortly be made public. The tenor of these reports may be easily anticipated, and what we shall learn from them will in all probability only be a more authentic record of the evidence we already possess, and a statement of conclusions which we may already foresee. The Select Committee, now reinstated, and we trust re-invigorated and stimulated by a lively consciousness of increased responsibility, arising from the terrible explosions which have occurred, as it were, in the midst of their deliberations, will doubtless devote special attention to this subject. It will be vexatious indeed, if from all these hopeful quarters, in addition to the accumulated labours, reports, and evidence of previous committees who have examined able and abundant witnesses relating to mining accidents, and of commissioners who have personally visited the pits, and have reported upon them in great detail, we do not ultimately obtain a satisfactory system for the benefit of the 315,000 coal-miners working in the inspected districts. With all the science, practical skill, and appliances at our command, it will be indeed distressing if these hard-working men should still continue to lose on the average one life for every 321 persons employed. A death on every working day in the year is surely not the ultimate attainable minimum of coal-mining mortality.

ART. X.—1. *On Parliamentary Government in England, its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation.* By ALPHEUS TODD, Librarian of the Legislative Assembly of Canada. In two vols. Vol. I. London: 1867.

2. *Her Majesty's Opposition, its responsibilities at the present Crisis.* London, 6th of April, 1867.

IT is a remarkable circumstance that we should be indebted to a resident in a distant colony, the librarian of the Canadian House of Parliament, for one of the most useful and complete books which has ever appeared on the practical operation of the British Constitution. The Colonies have not hitherto added much to the literary wealth of the Empire, though they are continually extending the range of our political experience. But a work like this, which has been undertaken and perfected by Mr. Todd, proves with what nice and eager attention the more cultivated minds in the Colonies watch every movement of opinion and every inflection of the great parliamentary engine in the mother country. Without any claim to the philosophic depth of Hallam, or the personal authority of Sir Thomas May in treating of the law of Parliament, Mr. Todd contents himself with the humbler, but not less serviceable, task of collecting and enregistering all that has been said and done by the best authorities and the latest decisions on the practice of the Constitution. His aim has been, not to explore the stream to its sources in mediæval antiquity, but to place in the hands of the public a compendium of its most recent applications. The precedents he cites do not extend beyond the reign of George III.; the opinions on which he relies are chiefly those of the statesmen and writers of our own time. We ourselves are bound to look with gratitude on his labours, for he has succeeded in distilling the essence of Whig principles from the pages of this Journal, and in digesting a multitude of scattered propositions thrown out at various times in the course of our periodical discussions. The late Sir George Lewis, the present Earl Grey, and the late Professor Austin (in his 'Plea for the Constitution') are the three writers to whom Mr. Todd is most largely indebted for the principles of his work. He could have chosen no better guides, for in these men the most sincere attachment to the cause of liberty and progress is ever united to a fearless moderation, and none of them would have sacrificed one jot of his political convictions to the adventitious rewards of public life. Mr. Todd probably knew nothing personally of these eminent men, and his sphere

of action lies far apart from theirs. It is therefore with the greater satisfaction that we see their opinions and example operating beyond the Atlantic, and reflected back upon ourselves from the American side of the Empire. We trust the publication of so sensible a book by a Canadian gentleman, at this time, may be propitious to the constitutional welfare of the Great Northern Confederation now about to be inaugurated with the cordial good wishes of the British people; and we hope that the future statesmen of that nation will never forget that if their independence is to be maintained, it will be by contrasting the principles of British Parliamentary Government in Canada with the purely republican and democratic institutions of the United States. Our own object and intention, at the present moment, is not to follow Mr. Todd through his volume, for it ought to be in the hands of every one who is interested in public affairs, but to offer some observations on the present extraordinary conjuncture in this country.

Mr. Todd remarks in his Preface that 'the great and increasing defect in all parliamentary governments, whether 'provincial or imperial, is the weakness of executive authority.' No doubt the fact is so. The executive authority of the Ministers of the Crown is barely sufficient to carry on, with difficulty, the current business of the nation, and is quite insufficient to originate and complete those vast and numerous improvements which the increasing exigencies of population and civilisation demand. We want at this moment a Government which shall be able to digest the written and unwritten law of the realm—to re-organise the army, so as to maintain the active forces abroad, and to create a reserve at home—to arm the fleet, and render it at least equal to the increased naval resources of foreign States—to reform the workhouses, and place under one comprehensive system the sanitary departments on which the lives of the population depend—to supply the inadequacy of judicial power for the present work of the country, especially in the highest Courts of Appeal—to deal energetically with the two great questions of Ireland, Tenancy and the Church, when the present paroxysm of disaffection has been overcome—to take up the whole question of the education of the people with far greater vigour, and to render it as far as possible obligatory—to raise the instruction and discipline of the public schools—to give an effective municipal government to the metropolis, capable of sweeping away the innumerable abuses of the present divided and incompetent vestry-administration; and to these objects of immediate practical interest, men of more advanced opinions than ourselves would

add other changes still more extensive, but which we regard as theoretical or immature. Who, then, is sufficient for these things? Who has the power to deal effectually with problems so intricate and so vast? Certainly not the executive ministers who derive their strength from the present House of Commons. For that, after all, is what we mean when we speak of 'the weakness of the executive.' We know very well that the executive has no inherent power of its own. That of the Crown is extremely limited, and the inherent power of prerogative is wasted to a dream. The force of the aristocratic principle, which was at one time great in this country, and indeed was the mainstay of the Government from 1688 to 1832, is so considerably abated, that in order to retain its social position, the aristocracy—even to the most Tory portion of it—is ready to make large and increasing concessions of political influence and power. A class of men in that condition distrusts its own authority, surrenders its own independence, and can originate no great social improvement. It comes, therefore, to this, that the Executive Power of this Empire must look to the House of Commons, as the representative of the people, and to that House almost alone, for the strength it is to use. That only, to borrow a metaphor from our mechanical engines, is the generator of power.

Does then the House of Commons, as it is now constituted, supply that power in sufficient abundance to work all the machinery of the State? Or are we reduced to the humiliating and dangerous confession that in this elaborate structure of parliamentary government the *vis motrix* is not equal to the efforts required of it, and that too much of this essential energy is consumed by the endless friction of the several parts? To acknowledge so fatal a defect in the institutions of government would be to pass upon them a sentence of condemnation; for in some day of peril or day of wrath, assuredly the complicated mechanism which does *not* do its work would be swept away, and liberty itself might perish in the passionate need of authority and action.

This then is a great evil and a great danger, and constitutes in our judgment the strongest argument for Reform. The House of Commons has shown on the Reform question a culpable amount of irresolution. It has not, till now, faced the difficulty. It has not chosen to admit that the changes proposed in the democratic sense would infuse greater energy and determination into its own councils; and that without some such infusion of fresh vigour, very few of the measures we have just enumerated are likely to be promptly and success-

fully carried. The tendency to talk too much and to act too little—to escape from great decisions by raising small collateral issues—and (as has been well said) to prevaricate with important questions, is injurious to the authority of a legislative assembly, and fatal to the executive energy of the Ministers who in fact live by that authority. As long as a popular assembly is regarded solely or mainly as a check upon the other branches of Government, the extension of its own powers tends of course to diminish the powers of the Sovereign or his Ministers. But the government of this country is past that stage in its history. The House of Commons has long ceased to be a mere check on the authority of the Crown. It is itself the chief depository of national force. Hence, whatever tends to invigorate the House of Commons, invigorates the Constitution. Recent experience has shown, in America and elsewhere, that nowhere is executive authority more absolute than when it is backed by the will of a very large section of the people. Popular representatives will impose on themselves tenfold the burdens and the efforts they would accept from others. The danger is that the governing authority in states thus democratically constituted should become too direct, arbitrary, and excessive. But in this country, though the chief power is in the House of Commons, there are still salutary institutions, independent of that House, which check and divide the action of the popular branch of the legislature, and avert that greatest of all dangers to public liberty, the paramount authority of any single power, whether it be called Priest, King, or People. That is the distinctive characteristic of the British Constitution.

It is needless to dwell upon these general observations; their application to the present state of affairs in this country is sufficiently obvious, although circumstances, and the strange desertion of political principles we are now witnessing, have singularly distorted the relative position of parties. We have never undervalued in these pages the utility of the Tory party in the complex structure of British Parliamentary Government. When Lord Derby was last in office in 1859 we expressed emphatically our conviction that the influence of the property, the abilities, and even the prejudices of the Tory party is an important element in the Constitution; and although we regret the obstacles they have frequently interposed to check the progress of salutary measures of enlightened improvement, that evil is more than compensated by the necessity of a full and complete discussion of every important change. Without the Tories there would be no party contests, and without party contests the machinery of parliamentary government would be

thrown off its balance. If party contests degenerated into a mere strife for office, irrespective of principles, they would become so odious and contemptible that the country would despise them, and no man of high honour would engage in them. It is in the essence of the Constitution that its ancient principles should be fairly maintained and defended against innovation, and this task naturally devolved on those who by station, property, and character are the children of tradition rather than the children of progress. These men, therefore, not unreasonably, were called the 'Conservative' party.

But what, we are constrained to ask, is modern Toryism? What are the principles of the present Tory leaders? In what manner are they now performing those functions which they assumed when out of office to be essential to the safety of the country? Mr. Disraeli informed his supporters, if we remember rightly at the last general election, that the party of which he is the leader had recently saved the Church and the Nation on two or three occasions. We presume that he would contend that another of these acts of patriotism was performed last session by rendering it impossible to carry a very moderate Reform Bill. But if he saw so much peril in the daring propositions of his political opponents, what charm has taken the sting out of his own Resolutions? He has recently assured Parliament and the readers of his published speeches that the scheme of an advanced democratic Reform Bill is no novelty to him, and that no man is better qualified than himself to carry such a measure. We give him credit for sincerity, and that he had long ago contemplated in his own meditations a scheme which would startle many an honest Whig and outbid the advanced guard of the Radicals; for an ingenious biographer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer may hereafter collect materials to prove that all he wanted was opportunity and the vantage ground of office to reverse and annihilate the old principles of the party which has raised him to power. Nay, it may be said of Mr. Disraeli that he is his own biographer, and that the literary creations of his youthful fancy prefigured the parts he was to perform in active life. On the Treasury Bench he realises the aspirations of Vivian Grey, he 'reveals his subtle mind in the stately counsels' of Sidonia and the social utopias of Sibyl. His sympathies have never really been with the Genius of Feudalism, which denounces the 'Monster Change'—

> 'When bold Subversion on his crafty face
> A gilded visor claps, and dubs himself
> Reform.'

But in the bolder flights of his 'Dardanian Dream' he draws a prophetic picture of a time when

> 'Famine, Disease, and Care
> This equal land have left; the rich man's curse
> And harsh command awake no echoes. Gold
> No more the only test of worth, but Labour
> Hath too its honours; from the busy hive
> Banished the drones: noble, and priest, and king
> Gorging the produce of a servile race,
> Servile and suffering, fainting as they feed
> The pampered few.'

These were, we are told, his early dreams; are they not revived in his latest actions? How came the poet of the 'Revolutionary Epic'* (from which these lines are taken) to become the leader and the guide of the Conservative party? Are the gifts of genius so rare among that party, that they look upon one who possesses them with the veneration paid by barbarous tribes to a medicine-man or a wood-dæmon? Or are the men who immolated Canning and broke with Peel entranced by the fascination of one who conjures with more powerful spells than those eminent statesmen ever knew?

No language used by a political opponent, no sarcasm aimed in debate, no revival of the abandoned principles of other days, could strike the Tory party so home or sting so sharply, as the humiliation and apostasy to which their own chief has compelled them to submit. It were cruel and vain to taunt them with their former prejudices and their present inconsistency, for the voice of their own memories is louder than the reproaches of their opponents. Either they were guilty of a great wrong in their resistance to the Bill of last year or they are guilty of a greater wrong now, in throwing open the gates still more widely to the classes they then refused to enfranchise. But in addition to the positive evil of the course they are pursuing, according to their own theory of government, they are guilty, and for the third time, of the offence of sacrificing to office the morality and consistency of public men. Who can believe in the good faith of their opposition to the Bill of last year, if their own Bill of this year goes beyond it? Who can believe in the wisdom or prudence of their Bill of this year, if their resistance to the Bill of last year was sincere?

It is impossible to doubt from their previous declarations,

* A new edition of this poem was published by Mr. Disraeli in 1864. It was written thirty years ago; but, like all his works, it throws light on the visionary but tenacious opinions of its author.

and from the manner in which they have set about this unwelcome task, that the great majority of the Conservative party and of the Cabinet are mere apprentices to the work of Reform. They have engaged in it, because they knew that they could not continue to hold office for ten days after the meeting of Parliament on any other conditions. But the clumsy, incoherent, and discordant efforts they have made to construct and reconstruct their imperfect Bills, prove—what indeed nobody denies—that they have been driven by the pressure of office to do what they never wished to do, and what they would have combated if it had been done by any one else. They have in truth neither heart nor head in the matter. The force which impels them is from without, not from within; and most of them still look upon the extension of the franchise as an inevitable evil, not as a measure of justice and good policy, destined to invigorate the institutions of the country.

When, in the autumn of 1845, Sir Robert Peel arrived at the conclusion that the Corn Laws must be repealed, in spite of the pledges of the Conservative party to uphold them, Lord Stanley—the Lord Stanley of those days—declared that even if the necessity of the measure were proved, the Conservatives were not the men to carry it. On this ground he withdrew from the Cabinet, broke up the Government, and when (on the failure of Lord John Russell to form a Ministry) Sir Robert Peel resumed office, Lord Stanley was not only not found among his former colleagues, but shortly afterwards became the acknowledged head of the Tory and Protectionist party. He has filled that important post for one and twenty years, exercising, though generally out of office, a powerful influence over public affairs and parliamentary debates. Mr. Disraeli, during the same period, has been his principal coadjutor in the House of Commons; and no leader of Opposition has ever had at his back a more docile and united body of adherents. It is now superfluous to ask to what point of the political compass he has steered their ship. It would be an easy, but an ungracious task, to turn against him the battery of sarcasm and invective with which he assailed the illustrious 'traitor' of 1846. The wheel of time has brought round its revenges. It is enough that we see Mr. Disraeli standing at the end of his long career in the identical position of Sir Robert Peel, and that the Tory party has once more been betrayed by its guides into another of those great liberal measures which it had never ceased, till now, to combat and to condemn.

But whilst we regret the factious obstruction offered to

Reform, when it was in the hands of those best qualified by their past services and their well-known principles to deal with it temperately, we are free to confess that all the difficulties of last year did not arise on the side of the Conservative Opposition—that public opinion both within the House of Commons and in the country had not reached the striking point; and that within the last few weeks the desire to extend the franchise has become so earnest and universal, that a Bill may now—perhaps for the first time— be carried which will command the assent of an immense majority of the nation. It is not for us to complain if the principles for which we have always contended, but which were so dreaded and decried by our opponents, are now adopted with as much fervour as if no one had ever disputed them. In the language of the Psalmist, 'The stone which the builders rejected is now become 'the head-stone of the corner.' It is the old story which Archbishop Whately was wont to tell, of the progress from error to truth:—first, the thing is impossible; secondly, no one wishes for it; thirdly, the proposition is self-evident, and everybody has embraced it.

But although we have no disposition to deal with this great question as if it were a personal matter, the effects of the course taken by the present Government upon the state of parties are so remarkable that we feel bound to comment on them. Had Lord Derby caused a moderate and rational measure of Parliamentary Reform to be prepared in the course of the recess, and brought it forward plainly and manfully at the opening of the session, with the support of all his colleagues, we say with the utmost sincerity and confidence that such a measure might have been carried without difficulty. Probably no Minister ever had such a golden opportunity of settling a great problem. But Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli have put their colleagues, their supporters, and their opponents to a severe trial. Indecision and want of principle in the construction of the measure—mystery and evasion in the form given to it—a willingness to abandon any pledge and to catch at any expedient—the abortive farce of Resolutions without a meaning, followed by the first proposition of a measure repudiated by its parents and abandoned by its nurse—had so discredited the sincerity and ability of the leading members of the Government, that when their final effort was made on the 18th of March, it was received without confidence and without respect. They had promised us 'Measure for Measure;' but the play they are performing is 'As you like it.' In these confused and rapid transformations they had failed to show

either consistency in their new faith or uniformity in their new attire. The classical mythologist described as the most fatal form of change that which cannot even abide in the shape it has last assumed:—

> 'Sunt, ô fortissime, quorum
> Forma semel mota est, et in hoc renovamine mansit;
> Sunt quibus in plures jus est transire figuras.'

And if these lines describe the hapless state of a party without a shape and without a creed, those which follow may be applied with singular precision to the career of their leader:—

> 'Ut tibi, complexi terram maris incola, Proteu.
> Nam modo te juvenem, modo te videre leonem,
> Nunc violentus aper: nunc quem tetigisse timerent
> Anguis eras; modo faciebant cornua taurum.
> Sæpe lapis poteras, arbor quoque sæpe videri.
> Interdum, faciem liquidarum imitatus aquarum,
> Flumen eras: interdum undis contrarius ignis.'

Already the course contemplated by Mr. Disraeli has cost the Cabinet three of its most able and honoured members; and it soon became apparent that these Ministers had carried off with them the colours of the regiment and the good name of the party for consistency and principle. At the meeting held on the 15th of March, at Lord Derby's house, Sir William Heathcote, the fitting representative of Oxford Conservatism, expressed his strong sympathy with the outgoing Ministers, and the manner in which his remarks were received sufficiently indicated what was passing in the minds of many of those who heard him. This sentiment has since been still more openly expressed in Parliament. From that moment the Conservative party was in truth resolved into two distinct elements: the one composed of the Tory politicians, of whom General Peel and Sir William Heathcote are the types, who will probably reconstitute, not without utility and credit, a small but honest and compact party under the able leadership of Lord Cranborne; the other composed of men who are weary of a life of opposition, and who have remained Conservatives in party long after they had ceased to be obstructives of opinion. The evolution of parties which is now taking place cannot fail to strengthen the supporters and the cause of those moderate liberal principles, which are equally opposed to obstructive Toryism and to violent Democracy. These gentlemen have become Whigs without knowing it. We have heard a good deal of excellent Whig doctrine delivered from behind the Treasury bench in both Houses in the course of the present session; and for all practical purposes they may, without the

slightest modification of opinion or loss of self-respect, be absorbed in that great political body which represents the cultivated opinion of the nation. But, as far as we can judge from the language and the acts of the present Cabinet, government by Tory Ministers on Tory principles is at an end.

When Lord Derby, on the formation of this Ministry, invited some members of the preceding Cabinet to join him, he must have foreseen that it was an idle ceremony, since such a coalition would have implied a total sacrifice of principle on the part of those who should join what called itself a Tory Government. Accordingly, even among the malingerers of the Whig army and the outlaws of the Cave, he did not pick up a recruit. If ever such a junction of men is formed, it must be based on no sacrifice of principle, but on a sincere conformity of views and conduct. The opinions actually held in common by a considerable section of the Conservative party and by the great majority of the Liberal party in Parliament are Whig opinions. There may be distinctions of colour, there may be traditions of party, to sever men who otherwise agree; but in the long run truth will have its way, and men will not fight for shadows only, when their inner convictions and their interests rally them to the same point.

In the concluding sentences of the last Number of this Journal, after adverting to the unfortunate differences which had led to a temporary division of the Ministerial supporters, and to the fall of the late Administration, we took occasion to remark that 'the future alone could solve the question who may be 'the chief destined to lead once more the united Liberal party.' The events of the last three months have already solved that question, and with a precision we could hardly then venture to anticipate. No one ever doubted that the eloquence of Mr. Gladstone, his extraordinary power of mastering and explaining the most difficult problems of finance, his versatile and abundant genius, and his cordial enthusiasm for all great and noble objects, place him in the first rank of the House of Commons, and, in respect to these qualifications, they place him in that rank alone. He has friends, he has coadjutors, he has colleagues, but he is without a rival. To these acknowledged and transcendent gifts he has, from the commencement of the present session of Parliament, added other claims, the result of judgment and experience; and these, if less showy and brilliant, are qualities still more indispensable than eloquence to the fulfilment of the highest duties of statesmanship. Of Mr. Gladstone it may emphatically be said—

'Nullum numen abest si sit prudentia.'

He wants no gift of genius or of character, provided he can secure the great faculty of commanding his strength and regulating his powers. Yet far from overrating his own remarkable qualifications for the highest post in the State, perhaps he is not himself entirely conscious of their relative importance; and owing to this modesty of judgment and diffidence of his own authority, those who know him well form a higher estimate of his powers than he does himself. It is evident from the calmer and more skilful policy he has followed in the present discussion, that the experience of last year has not been unprofitable; and that he has been reminded of the Apostolic precept, 'He who striveth for the mastery must be temperate in all things.' Politics are the sharpest school of character. Absolute self-command is the condition of complete success. A statesman is not a perfect master of his art until he can combine the energy of a strong and eager nature with an entire mastery over every word, every look, and every action.

In the course of the present session Mr. Gladstone has shown many of these higher qualities. He played for two months a waiting game, at every move of which he was rewarded by a fresh blunder of his antagonists, and a further improvement of his own position. Throughout the earlier part of the session he carefully postponed and avoided every display of party hostility. The tedious vacillation of the Treasury Bench did not provoke him into firing a shot before the time; and even the disappointment at the provisions of the Bill which he expressed with great animation on the 18th of March, did not prevent him from yielding to the opinion of those who thought it inexpedient to take a division on the second reading. It is obvious that in the present temper of the party he gains strength every time he falls back on the moderation and forbearance of the majority of his supporters—he loses it when he is tempted to yield to the impulse of the more eager portion of them. The great chief of the Opposition, resting in his strength, is less concerned to spread division in the ministerial ranks, for the conduct of their leaders is doing that work for him, than to concentrate his own resources, to effect that paramount object of the true union of the whole Liberal party about him, and then to wait the moment when its force and resolution will tell with effect.

The various, and sometimes conflicting elements, which are combined in the character and the career of Mr. Gladstone, though they have ere this led him into contradictions, and may hereafter lead him into difficulties, correspond to the multifarious elements of which the whole body of the Liberal party must ne-

cessarily consist. For it is in the nature of things that the party which looks to change and improvement as the aim of its existence, must be more broad in its basis and more varied in its tendencies, than the party which rests upon the track of past traditions. No one can doubt the genuine sympathy of Mr. Gladstone with popular interests and opinions in their broadest sense. He is penetrated with the conviction that the true welfare of the people is the *suprema lex;* and with the characteristic impulsiveness of his character he has sometimes expressed that feeling with such intensity as to lead men to suppose that he shared some of the views of the extreme party. The speculations of Mr. Mill and the harangues of Mr. Bright are not inspired—as they would, we think, themselves admit—with a more honest and single-hearted conviction that Power is a great trust held for the benefit of the community at large. To Mr. Gladstone's ability the people owe several of the recent institutions most conducive to economy and public convenience, and large remissions of taxation which have improved the condition of every household in the land. But Mr. Gladstone is himself a living proof that the greatest services to the people are often not rendered by those who are the mere organs of popular power. Cultivated statesmanship, a due regard for the traditional institutions of England, a conscientious and disinterested resolution to follow the course of duty, are the most essential qualities of the Minister who is to carry on the work of government and of reform in this country. Mr. Gladstone brings these mixed qualities to the service of the nation; and probably they have grown in him to higher perfection by the fact that he is not the child of any particular party, and that his mind has passed through several phases of opinion. He has not forsworn that conservative feeling, that veneration of the past, which he imbibed from Oxford, any more than he has lost the refinement of his tastes or bounded the range of his scholarship. But he has modified the opinions of his early life by a more enlarged perception of the exigencies of the age, and by the conviction that it is unjust to resist the claims of large bodies of our fellow-subjects to a participation in the franchise, though it may not be difficult to direct to objects of common utility that power in which they have a common share. He is, therefore, preeminently the man to re-constitute the Liberal party at this juncture on a broad and comprehensive basis; and we are sanguine enough to believe that the time is not far distant when it will be in the power of Mr. Gladstone to form a vigorous administration, supported by a large and active majority in Parlia-

ment and in the nation. That is the object to which we look forward, and its attainment is in the highest degree probable if he perseveres in the moderate, firm, and dignified course which has marked his conduct in opposition. To rise above this miserable scene of principles abandoned, of reputations damaged, of characters degraded, of men paralysed, of institutions weakened, of government arrested, we want more than a Ministry: the country wants a Minister, who can revive and retain that confidence which follows unity of policy and of purpose. When the Head of Government is equal to his office in difficult times, his force radiates through his colleagues to each department of administration, through Parliament to every section of his party, through the press to every sphere of society. It is bad for the nation that the symbols of Empire should be held low. Men are willing enough to follow when they feel and know that they are led with strength and with wisdom. If Parliamentary Government were in truth no more than that system of compromises and evasions which it sometimes becomes in weak and unprincipled hands, we should indeed deplore, with the author of the book before us, the inevitable decline of executive authority. But we think otherwise. Parliamentary Government is very much what men make it. It was a means of corruption under Walpole, it was an instrument of severe repression and heavy burdens under Pitt, it was feeble under Lord Liverpool, it became a glorious instrument of reform under Lord Grey and Lord John Russell, it was honourable and useful under Sir Robert Peel; and though it may have been discredited by the present government, it will shine with undiminished radiance in the hands of their successors. We have said these things because it appears to us to be the part of those who are not engaged in the diurnal contentions of Parliament or the press, to endeavour to look beyond the question of the hour to the main stream of events. The conditions of a Reform Bill, the merits of this or that expedient to extend or restrict the franchise, have often been discussed in these pages, and are at this moment canvassed with great ingenuity in a thousand forms throughout the country. The forms and terms of a law of Parliamentary Representation may be varied *ad infinitum*. There is no such thing as an ideal Statute of Elections, and it is extremely difficult, in deciding on so complicated a question, ever to bring it to a single issue. To throw the question of Reform to Parliament and the country to play with, as Mr. Disraeli attempted to do by Resolutions which resolved nothing, was therefore mischievous; and it is not much wiser or better to

propose a measure of so elastic a material that it may be squeezed into a thousand shapes.

However tedious and irksome the process of discussion on a series of Reform Bills, in their general principles and in their minute details, may have become, it would be rash and unjust to disparage the process or to undervalue the result. It is of the essence of Parliamentary Government that the great acts of legislation, which embody the will of a people, and determine its future government, should be slowly worked out. They are not the products of arbitrary power, but of growth; and they cannot be completed until the mind of Parliament and of the country has been imbued with the subject, until every objection has been considered, and until the opinion of a powerful majority has been moulded into uniformity by the advance of truth and the refutation of error. Let any one compare the progress of the measure now before Parliament, with that of the Reform Bill of 1832, which we have had occasion to relate in another part of this Journal. The blow was then sharp, short, and decisive; but it was accompanied by a convulsion which threatened the institutions of the country; it was driven on by acts of violence; it was resisted with frantic obstinacy, by men who believed that they were on the brink of a revolution, and who did a good deal to render that revolution probable. We confess that we greatly prefer the present state of affairs. The result of discussion and of circumstances has been that all resistance to the principle of Reform has vanished. It is admitted by all parties (with very few wayward exceptions) that a large enfranchisement of the non-electoral classes is just and expedient. The controversy which is still going on relates entirely to the mode of effecting this object. We do not impute to the authors of the new Reform Bill so absurd or so dishonest a scheme as an attempt to substitute a sham measure for a real one; and if any members of the Tory party entertained so ridiculous a design, they are by this time undeceived as to the possibility of carrying it. Practically their measure does include a very large number of new electors, and in its progress through Committee we trust it may be made to include, on equal terms, all those to whom the majority of the House of Commons desires to extend the franchise. The ingenuity of those who have conducted the argument on both sides has really worn down the line of distinction to a very thin partition; and that difference of opinion is more in words than in things, more in form than in substance. The fairest test to be applied to a measure

of Reform, when it is completed, would be to inquire whether there is still any class of the population excluded from the franchise on whom it would be desirable to confer it.

In the earlier stages of this discussion the Ministers of the Crown made their own position appear worse than it has since turned out to be, by the use of vague and unmeaning expressions. Nothing could be more inaccurate than Mr. Disraeli's attempt to draw a distinction between 'popular 'privileges' and 'democratic rights'; and he was equally unfortunate in his attempt to persuade the House that a law of representation could be, or ought to be, based on any uniform and unbending principle. The British Constitution, it was contended, rested on the suffrages of men who paid their rates; and with an 'unerring instinct' the House of Commons made this great discovery in the course of last session, and thereby turned out the Whig Government. But no sooner is a measure propounded on this sacred principle, than it is discovered that an enormous number of persons do not pay their rates at all, but compound for them; that this composition rests partly on local Acts and partly on the will of the parochial authorities; and lastly, that this fundamental condition altogether excludes the whole class of lodgers, in whom Mr. Disraeli has long felt a paternal interest. Again, to many minds the words 'Household Suffrage' convey an assurance of finality, and a basis which may be relied on, when combined with a certain term of residence and with local taxation. But on closer examination, it turns out that the words 'Household Suffrage' have no precise legal meaning, and that the law must still define by a reference to other conditions what it means by an electoral householder. Those conditions, therefore, become essential, and do in reality determine the extent to which the franchise should be carried. We have learned from experience that it is not consistent with the multiform state of our society, and with the varied terms of our local administration, to lay down any principle as the exclusive basis of our electoral system. Whatever the principle may be it must be adjusted and corrected by additions and exceptions.

But even when the Government professed to lay down a principle, and to build upon it, they at the same time disfigured their structure with excrescences. Thus, some imaginative member of the Cabinet led his colleagues into the fly-trap of dual voting, by way of a security against the greatest popular force which has ever been admitted to power in this country; a proposal which we discussed about two years ago, and which

Mr. Disraeli now describes as a scheme for which not even a philosopher has a word to say. The savings' bank franchise, the direct taxation franchise, the professional franchise, were coinage of the same mint; and although we see no great harm in some of these propositions, which indeed had in part been made before by Mr. Gladstone himself and by Mr. Clay, yet they were obvious departures from that principle which, as it was said, was to be the future basis of representation. The form in which the various proposals of contending parties really seem to come together is Household Suffrage limited by the personal payment of rates; and if the limit of the direct payment of rates were fixed by law at five pounds, we should arrive at a five pound rating franchise, which does not very materially differ from the seven pound rental franchise of last session.

The document entitled 'Her Majesty's Opposition,' which has been circulated by authority within the last few days, states in a very clear and succinct form the anomalies of the Government measure. Many of them are so monstrous that they cannot have been foreseen by the author of the Bill and must be corrected. The conclusion at which the leaders of the Liberal Party have arrived is stated in the following terms:—

'It seems to us that a far more satisfactory plan than that proposed in the Bill would be to draw a certain line, above which all householders should be equally entitled to be registered as electors, and below which the franchise should not extend. The line should, of course, be one by which the artisan class in boroughs should generally be admitted to the franchise, and by which those householders only would be excluded who, from their poverty and circumstances, may, as a class, have a claim to be excused from the direct payment of rates. A wise and liberal enfranchisement would thus be granted free from any invidious inequality among those entitled to the suffrage, and all apprehensions of danger from extending the franchise indiscriminately to the lowest class of householders would be removed.'

This is the distinct ground on which the Opposition rests its proposal for the modification of the Government Bill; and it is with a view to the adoption of such a line that Mr. Gladstone gave notice on the 5th of April of an Instruction to be moved before going into Committee. The latter portion of this Instruction was, however, withdrawn in compliance with the wishes of a considerable section of the Liberal party, because it appeared that the first line of it (which was accepted by the Government) gave the House full power to deal with the law of rating in Committee, and because the remainder of it was thought to savour of an intention to

obstruct and defeat the Bill, which both Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Coleridge had solemnly disavowed.

The danger is, and it is at this moment essential to point it out, that once in Committee the House may be led astray by a multiplicity of perplexing issues, tending to conceal the main question. If the plan proposed by the Government and adopted by the House involves the establishment of a principle of the broadest character, it is idle to suppose that the franchise can be limited by nominal securities or disqualifications, scattered through the remaining clauses of the Bill. On that principle, whatever it be, the future representation of the people will rest, and it will be far too powerful to be controlled hereafter by artificial or imaginary barriers. Here, therefore, it is of the first importance that a cordial union should exist between all sections of the Liberal party, and that they should co-operate upon a definite understanding and fixed principle of action. If the conflicting and contradictory provisions of the Bill were carried by the alternate support of one or the other section of the House, the result would be an anomalous measure with which no party would be satisfied. It is only by strict union and discipline that the Liberal party can render the measure both safe and comprehensive; and on them this responsibility has been thrown by the conduct of the Government.

We think, however, that at this moment, when the Easter recess proclaims a temporary suspension of Parliamentary warfare, the question has reached a point with which the friends of Reform have no reason to be dissatisfied. We cordially concur in the opinion, which has been strongly manifested by the great bulk of the Liberal party, that whatever may have been the vacillation of the Government and the defects of a Bill drawn up by Ministers who did not know their own minds, there was no sufficient reason to reject it and to plunge the country into fresh agitation, which must have lasted many months. The remarkable speech of Mr. Disraeli on the second reading of the Bill (26th March), and the alterations which he has since introduced, were supposed to indicate that he had mastered the hesitation of his dissentient colleagues, that he was no longer afraid of his own supporters, and that he was personally by no means disinclined to treat with the most advanced advocates of Reform, upon such terms as the House of Commons may think it reasonable to adopt. This may not be a dignified course, but that is not a question for our consideration. The all-important point for the country is to ascertain whether advantage can be taken of this singular

conjuncture to frame and carry a satisfactory measure; and as the power to frame and carry it is left in great measure to the House of Commons itself, the House will be censured if it fails in the attempt. To reject Reform merely because it proceeds from the hands of a Tory Minister, would be as factious and absurd as if we had rejected Free Trade from the hands of Sir Robert Peel, or Catholic Emancipation from the hands of the Duke of Wellington. The House of Commons responded with more than usual cordiality to the appeal of Mr. Disraeli when he exclaimed at the end of his speech, in the very words (if we remember rightly) used by Sir Robert Peel on a similar occasion in 1846, 'We ask you to pass the Bill. 'You can then turn us out afterwards if you please. But 'pass the Bill!'

It appears to us, then, that the House of Commons deserves great credit for the firmness, temper, and perseverance with which it has stuck to its task under circumstances which have frequently been extremely discouraging. With that practical good sense which is its most constant characteristic, the House has seen that this thing has now to be done; and that however inconvenient it may be to deal with such rude and incoherent materials, it will not allow itself to be diverted from a great public object either by party motives or by the objections which might fairly be urged against the mode of proceeding. To reach this point the Tory party have made great sacrifices—they have sacrificed their traditions, their consistency, and almost everything that was once called their principles: they have agreed to adopt a course of action hardly, if at all, distinguishable from that which their political opponents have long advocated; and by this act they render it possible to settle an important question, which might otherwise have remained for years the battle-field of parties, until a torrent of popular agitation swept over it. The Liberal party, on the other hand, are called upon to make no sacrifices beyond a temporary exclusion from office, which the conditions of this very measure will in all probability tend to shorten. They have the satisfaction to see their principles triumph on the whole line, not by crushing or defeating their antagonists, but by converting those very antagonists into the instruments to carry them into effect. They have the satisfaction to know that by whatever influences this change has been wrought upon the Tories, it has struck a deadlier blow at Toryism than any other event of this century, for with the exception of those who have stood aloof from this measure, at the cost of power, not a man is left in Lord Derby's ranks who can,

without stultifying himself, revert to the obsolete creed of that party. They have given in their adhesion to popular government, to an extent no Tory statesman ever dreamed of before. They have abandoned the vain task of stemming the tide of the times. We trust that the sincerity of their conversion will be equal to its extent; and that when the House of Commons resumes its labour in Committee after the recess, the country may at the close of the session be congratulated on the result of its labours.

No. CCLVII. will be published in July.

INDEX.

A

America, North, review of works on the archæology of, 332—the Mexicans, 333—the Aztecas, 335—Anahuac, 336—ancient buildings, 339—earthworks, 347—castrametation, 350—objects of art, 351—parallelisms between the primeval history of America and the Old World, 356—pyramids, 358.

B

Beugnot, Comte Albert, review of his 'Mémoires du Comte Beugnot,' 303—his birth and early life, 305—his acquaintance with Madame de Lamotte, 305 *et seq.*—and with Cagliostro, 307—the Revolution, 311—the Conciergerie, 312—Fauchet, 313—Bailly, 313—Madame Roland, 314—Queen Marie Antoinette, 315—Napoleon at Mayence, 318—end of the first empire, 322—Louis XVIII. and the Comte d'Artois, 324–6—l'Abbé de Pradt, 325—the Hundred Days, 328.

C

Coal mines, fatal accidents in, 549—grievances of the miners, 549—causes of deaths in coal mines, 551—ventilation, 552—light, 556—blasting coal, 558—fire-damp, 560—proposed exhibition of mining implements, &c., 562—after-damp, 563—falls of the roof, 564—drawing the props, 566—coal-cutting machines, 566—shaft accidents, 567—miscellaneous accidents, 568—inspection, 570—recent explosions, 577.

E

Early English Texts, publication of, 219—Percy's 'Reliques,' 220—new edition of the Percy Ballads, 221—nationality of the ballads, 223—revived study of early literature in England, 225—in Germany, 226—in France, 228—literary book-clubs and their works, 232 *et seq.*

F

Ferguson, Adam, his personal appearance and abilities, 48–9—a manse, 49—Ferguson's ancestors, 50–1—the rebellion of 1715, 57—Ferguson at Fontenoy, 62—his subsequent life, 63 *et seq.*—his ethical system, 79—at Neidpath Castle, 82—Walter Scott, 83—Ferguson's death, 85.

G

Glass-painting, review of works relating to, 154—Munich and English glass, 155—spirit in which the early works were undertaken, 158—primary requirements of painted glass, 160—ancient

and modern glass compared, 166—steps in the production of a glass-painting, 173.

Grey, Earl, review of his 'Correspondence with William IV.,' 516—the Reform Bill, 518—part taken by the King, 521—his letters, 522—Lord Brougham's proposed Bill, 525—Lord Grey's first Reform Bill, 528—dissolution of 1831, 529—the second Reform Bill, 533—Colonel Napier's speech at Devizes, 534—the Bristol riots, 535—the creation of peers, 539—Lord Lyndhurst's motion, 541—Lord Grey's resignation and recall, 543–5—the royal assent given to the Reform Bill, 547.

L

Lawrence, Sir John, review of his foreign policy, 1—duty of the Indian Foreign Officers, 2—war in Bhootan, 4—the Wahabees of Nedjed, 8—tragedy at Sohar, 14—affairs of Affghanistan, 17—Chinese Tartary, 34—Kokand and Bokara, 36—Russian invasion, 41.

Louis XV., review of works relating to the reign of, 470—his youth, 472—his marriage, 475—his queen, 476—Fleury, 477—the Duc de Richelieu, 481—the King's furious gaiety, 482—Madame de Mailly and her sister, 483–5—France, Austria, and Prussia, 485—Duchess of Châteauroux, 490—the King at the head of his army, 493—his illness at Metz, 494—Madame Pompadour, 498—the Seven Years' War, 504–5—Cardinal de Bernis, 506—destruction of the order of the Jesuits, 508—Madame du Barry, 510—the King's death-bed, 511—review of his character and reign, 512.

M

Meteoric Showers, 252 — predictions of meteoric showers, 253 — that of November 1866, 254 — colours and extent of the meteors, 257 — former appearances, 258 — movement of the meteoroids, 261 — meteorites, 264 — aërolites, 265 — 'meteors of St. Lawrence,' 267.

P

Parliament, the private business of, 85 — personal Acts, 88 — Road Acts, 89 — Waterworks Acts, 89 — schemes for amendment of the private business, 91 — railways, 92 — legislation in Belgium, Germany, and France, 102 — private bill legislation of the United States, 103.

Parties, position and prospect of, 269 — result of the general election of 1865, 269 — arguments for and against Reform, 270 — the Bill of last year, 275 — Mr. Bright, 279 — result of last session, 283 — the Tory Reform Bill, 284 — Mr. Disraeli's idea of Estates, 289 — the Reform League, 293 — difficulties of the present Government, 298.

Pasteur, M. L., review of his 'Corpuscules Organisés,' &c., 389 — former views, 389—the microscope, 390—electrical spiders, 390—infusoria, 391 — fungi, 393 — ferments, 394—Needham and Spal-

lanzani, 396 — Pouchet, 397 — recent experiments, 398–407 — 'bleeding bread,' 407–9.

Prussian Campaign of 1866, 363 — strategy of the campaign, 364 — the occupation of Saxony, 365 — forces on both sides, 367 — action of the Crown Prince and that of Prince Frederick Charles, 371 — Skalitz, 373–5 — Eypel, 375 — Alt-Rognitz, 376 — Königgratz and Sadowa, 379 — operations of the Hanoverian army, 386 — defeat of the Bavarians and Hesse-Darmstädters, 389.

R

Rawlinson, George, review of his 'Five Great Monarchies of the Eastern World,' 108 — Assyria, 110–14 — Chaldæa, 117 — Babylon, 119.

Ritualism, 439 — struggles of the High Church party and the 'Evangelical' school, 439 — the Gorham controversy, 440 — the present struggle, and the main controversy, 440 *et seq.* — vestments, 445 — insubordination, 449–50 — 'The Church and the World,' 451 *note* — view of the Sacrament, 453 — intolerance of the Ritualistic school, 456 — tendencies of its proceedings, 458 — its views and objects, 464 — charge of Bishop Thirlwall, 467.

T

Tenant compensation in Ireland, review of works relating to, 187 — grievances of Ireland, 187 — Committee of 1865, 189 — principle of Compensation, 194—custom in Scotland, 199—leases, 203 —emigration, 204 — Mr. Butt's views, 205 — the Fenian programme, 209 — Mr. Chichester Fortescue's Bill, 211.

Todd, Alpheus, review of his 'Parliamentary Government in Eng-'land,' 578 — defect in parliamentary government, 579 — the strongest argument for Reform, 580 — importance of the Tory party, 581 — its principles, 582 — its Reform Bill, 584 — the Liberal party and Mr. Gladstone, 587 — justice and expediency of a Reform, 591 — anomalies of the Government measure, 593 — ground on which the Opposition rests its proposal as to the Government Bill, 593 — danger of Committee on the Bill, 594.

W

Wornum, R. N., review of his 'Life and Works of Hans Holbein,' 410 — English predilection for portraits, 410 — Holbein's ornament, 413 — Holbein's family, 414 — his works, 419 *et seq.*

THE END OF VOL. CXXV.

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, LONDON.

(48)
13-4

BINDING SECT. MAY 2 1966

34134

Edinburgh Review
Vol. 125. Jan.- Apr. 1867

P
LE
E

NAME OF BORROWER.

DATE.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED